

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. XCIX.—JANUARY, 1860.

ARTICLE I.—SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S LECTURES.

Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic. By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, etc. Edited by Rev. HENRY L. MANSEL, B. D., Oxford, and JOHN VEITCH, M. A., Edinburgh. In two volumes. Vol. I.—Metaphysics. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

For learning, acuteness, and vigor, in their happiest combination, few men have equalled, and still fewer surpassed, Sir William Hamilton. Preliminary to an attempt at sketching, in outline, some points in his psychological system, we will narrate a few facts regarding his personal history. He was a native of Glasgow, born in the year 1788. He descended from an ancient family, some of whose members have played a conspicuous part in Scottish history. His father and grandfather had successively held the chair of Anatomy and Botany in the University of Glasgow. The title to the Baronetcy which he bore, was hereditary, but it had for many years lain dormant, and was revived by the philosopher himself, who successfully established his claim to it in 1816. After completing the course of study at Glasgow, he entered Balliol College, Oxford. Here he greatly distinguished himself, by his success in study, and the unprecedented *eclat* of his examination as a candidate for honors. He seems to have fairly wearied out the examiners, by the number of the works in which he had prepared himself, and to have gone altogether beyond them in familiarity with rare and difficult authors.

At the age of twenty-four, he left Oxford, with its highest honors, and returned to Scotland. The following year, he entered at the bar in Edinburgh, and began practice as an advocate. In 1820, he was an unsuccessful candidate for the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, which had become vacant by the retirement of Dugald Stewart, and the death of his successor, Thomas Brown. John Wilson, the poet, and tory editor of *Blackwood*, was his opponent, and, strange to say, a successful one. But as the election turned upon the political, rather than the philosophical, qualifications of the candidates, success was no honor to Wilson, and defeat no disgrace to Hamilton. In the following year, he was appointed by the Faculty of Advocates, in whom the right of election was vested, to the chair of Universal History. While the incumbent of this chair, he prepared and delivered a short course of lectures, which are represented as worthy of his learning and ability, but they seem not to have attracted much attention. About this period, he made an examination of the claims of Phrenology, which had been embraced and propagated with great zeal in Scotland. Sir William having inherited a taste for Anatomical and Physiological pursuits from his father, gave the new and pretentious system, a most thorough examination. We are told by Mr. Baynes, in his article upon Sir William, in the *Edinburgh Essays*, to which we are indebted for many of the personal facts we have given, that he at this time went through a "laborious course of Comparative Anatomy, made numerous experiments upon the living animal, and dissected, with his own hand, several hundred different brains; while, in order to ascertain the truth with regard to the frontal sinus, he sawed open a series of skulls of different nations, both sexes, and all ages." Two papers, embodying the result of these investigations, were read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh, in the year 1826. These labors contributed powerfully to that reaction which reduced this once popular system to public contempt. These investigations gave Sir William that mastery of the Physiology of the nervous system which contributed so much to the soundness and clearness of his subsequent works on Psychology. In 1829, he published the celebrated

criticism of Cousin, in the *Edinburgh Review*. This paper made a profound impression upon the public mind, was almost immediately translated into the French and Italian languages, and established his claim, which has never since been questioned, to the peerage of European mind. The importance of this paper is enhanced by its having become the metaphysical basis of the justly celebrated Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel. It is important, also, as the key-note to all the author's subsequent speculations of a purely metaphysical character. In 1830, he wrote his review of Brown, entitled "The Philosophy of Perception," and, in 1833, the article entitled "Recent Treatises on Logical Science." These articles indicated the most profound and various knowledge of the fundamental questions in Metaphysics, Psychology, and Logic respectively, and established a reputation for the author, which lapse of time will only solidify and strengthen.

In 1836, he became a candidate for the chair of Metaphysics, at Edinburgh. After a hotly contested election, in which Isaac Taylor, the well-known Essayist, and George Combe, the Phrenologist, were his competitors, he was elected. Subsequently to his election, he published his edition of Reid, the foot notes to which were written in 1837-8. The supplementary Dissertations appended to this edition, were prepared at different periods, between the years 1841 and 1846. These Dissertations were, however, never finished, the edition of 1849 actually ending in the middle of a sentence. Notwithstanding the recent publication of his Lectures, Hamilton's latest actual contributions to philosophical literature are found in these Dissertations.

The Lectures now published, were prepared, as the editors inform us, during the College session of the year 1836-7. Each Lecture was written on the day or evening previous to its delivery, and they were never altered, except by oral explanations, or modifications, made during delivery. Consequently, they do not necessarily represent the latest results of the author's studies; nor were they ever deemed by him a complete, or entirely adequate, exhibition of his views. It appears that he never revised them for the press, designing to incorporate those discussions which had not been already published

in substance, in his other works, into the Dissertations requisite to the completion of his edition of Reid. This design, unhappily he never fulfilled. We are obliged to look to his edition of Reid, unfinished as it is, for the latest form of Hamilton's system.

All must confess to a feeling of disappointment, that these Lectures do not give us the maturest product of the philosopher's thought, ripened and modified by years of experience in instruction. It is only, however, when we compare Hamilton with himself, that we feel this disappointment. Judged by ordinary standards, these Lectures would be considered models of philosophical discussion. We ought not to expect, in Lectures designed for the raw and undisciplined students of the second year of a Scotch University course, the marvellous conciseness of the criticism of Cousin, the splendid dialectic of the review of Brown, or the more than scholastic acuteness and delicacy of analysis which give character to the Appendixes to Reid. The Lectures are adapted with great skill to their purposes. They have done a great work on the minds of successive generations of students. They have founded a school of Philosophy, destined to affect the current of abstract thought in all coming time. As published, they will greatly increase the points of contact between Hamilton and the mass of cultivated men, and augment his influence in proportion. But, from the nature of the case, they cannot add to the author's reputation, among careful and thorough students of his works heretofore published. Great numbers, however, who have been repelled from his other writings by their multifarious learning, thorny distinctions, and enormous range of generalization, will read these Lectures with profit and delight, and be prepared to appreciate, for themselves, the greatness of the Philosopher which, up to this time, they had received on trust. The style of the Lectures is clear, terse, and pointed, admirably adapted to the purposes of scientific discussion, rising occasionally to a chaste and lofty eloquence, and every where marked by the unmistakable impress of the highest forms of intellectual power.

The learning of Hamilton was, in the fullest sense of the term, *immense*. Of philosophical writers, ancient and mod-

ern, we believe his knowledge, in extent and exactness, to have been equal, if not superior, to that of any man of his time. He was distinguished for his legal learning while at the bar. His acquaintance with Anatomy and Physiology was worthy of a professional naturalist. He introduced into Great Britain a new era in the history of education and learned schools. His analysis of the evidence bearing on the authorship of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, is a model, both for its acuteness and historical learning. As a critic, and expositor of philosophical systems, it may be questioned if the world has furnished his equal. He was preëminently a master in criticism, and it has seemed to us that he just falls short of taking place among the greatest philosophers of the world, from the predominance of the critical and dialectic, over the inductive and constructive tendencies in his mental constitution. In the exposure of pretension, and the detection of false claims to learning or discovery, he was searching and merciless, and showed a zeal amounting to absolute fierceness. He had an assortment of torturing-boots and thumb-screws, which he applied to offenders with a zest which vindicated his claim of kindred with the stern old Covenanter, through whom he represented the Hamiltons of Preston. The reader feels an irrepressible sympathy for a literary culprit, when under his treatment, and experiences a sort of relief when he can track the critic in garbling an old author; or when Hare compels him to acknowledge the use, at second hand, of Bossuet's tessellated, and rather unfair, quotations from Luther on the Bondage of the Will. The polemic character of most of Hamilton's works, may have given rise to many of those extremes of statement which require modification in order to be adopted for scientific truth. His power as a critic has doubtless deterred his contemporaries from expressing their dissent from his views, and deprived him of the benefit which such criticism would have conferred. The brilliancy of his genius, and the extent of his learning, have so impressed, and even oppressed, the minds of his pupils and followers, that it seems impossible for their mental activity to deviate from the grooves which the great master has plowed for them.

The philosophical system of Hamilton, must be gathered

from a careful reading of his whole works, and a careful comparison of the various portions of them with each other, having reference, always, to the circumstances of the writer, and the points of view from which, at successive periods, he looked at the subjects discussed. It is just to say that, in spirit and intention, he adopts the cautious and reverent method of the great founder of Scottish Philosophy, Thomas Reid. The system of Reid he has clarified and supplemented. He has reduced it to logical order, fixed its foundations and vindicated its claims, with such learning and power, that he has become the second founder of Scottish Philosophy. He has done for it a work greater than that achieved for the Newtonian Physics, by the exhaustive analysis of Laplace. Where Hamilton has swerved from a cautious and sound method, we trace the influence of the system and terminology of Kant, which early obtained a powerful hold upon his mind. Connected with this, we see the effect of an excessive trust in the processes and results of formal logic, and a tendency to apply it to subject matter, which, transcending the limits of human knowledge, is, by consequence, incapable of sharp and distinct definition. His marvellous capacity for abstract thought, by which he was able to deal with the highest generalizations and the subtlest distinctions as if they were physical entities in time and space, led him, at times, to confound concepts and singular terms with one another.

We may best set before our readers the merits of Hamilton, by sketching, in outline, his Philosophy of Perception, giving incidental hints of its points of difference from antecedent and contemporary systems, and making such few criticisms as our limits will permit. We take this course the more willingly, as this is the department in which he most excelled, and because all sound thinking, in every department of Philosophy, must depend upon sound views of this, the starting point and basis of all. The primordial facts of consciousness, are, in reality, simple and obvious. But various considerations, both physical and mental, have conspired, in the history of speculation, to obscure or set them aside. Let us glance at a portion of them. The fundamental antithesis

between the conscious ego, which knows, and the forms of matter which are known, as well as between God, and the universe of matter, was impressed upon the Greek philosophers at the very dawn of distinct psychological and theological investigation. The forces of mind, whether finite or infinite, were found in relation to matter. The question regarding the mode of that intercourse, the effects of which were every where seen, was naturally mooted. That the intercourse of God with the world could be immediate, in its creation or preservation, hardly seems to have entered the Greek mind. The same difficulties have beset the moderns, and the mere statement and explanation of the various theories of this relation would fill a volume. A similar difficulty occurred, when the attempt was made to explain *how* the mind of man gets a knowledge of the outward and material. Very early, it seems to have been assumed that mind could know only by actually enveloping or permeating the object of its knowledge. Obviously, this process could take place only on the condition that some shadowy film, of exceedingly attenuated material, or some matterless appearance, phantasm, or form, came into relation to the mind, and mingled with or was enveloped in its very substance. Generalized, this assumed notion took the form of the maxim, which most philosophers, ancient and modern, have taken for granted, without proof, "that the relation of knowledge involves an analogy, in the mode of existence, between the knowing subject and the thing actually known." Matter as solid or extended, is as sharply as possible distinguished from mind in the mode of its existence. Separated from mind, in the words of John Norris, by the "whole diameter of being," it can be known, if the above assumption be true, only through some vicarious entity or mode of existence, representing, but not really or numerically identical with, the material body known. Regarding the manner in which these films, or forms, or modalities, which were supposed to be the only, actual, direct, and really present objects of the mind's knowledge, were generated, two broadly contrasted schools soon came to exist, destined to continue, either absolutely or partially distinct, in all subsequent specu-

lation, down to the present time. One school supposed that the forms of external things actually in contact with, or in relation to the mind, were generated by impact of a body upon the senses, which, in some way, produced a copy of the body itself, which became the property of the mind, and represented to it the outward object which itself remained unknown, except as the putative generator of the form or image enveloped or permeated by the mind. Roughly speaking, this school is represented by Aristotle. Though Hamilton hazards the assertion that he was a natural realist, it is evident that the great body of his pupils and followers were not, and, besides, the idea is inconsistent with other essential parts of his system. Throughout the middle ages, modifications of this notion were prevalent, under the authority of the great philosopher's name. The other school, which may be represented as the Platonic, supposed the existence of patterns, or forms, of all material things, antecedent to, and independent of, the material creation. These were supposed to be in every human mind, but out of consciousness; they having been brought into this world from an anterior and more spiritual mode of existence, where they had been acquired by direct intercourse with the immortal gods. The world of sense was supposed to be formed after the models of these substantial and perfect forms; but, from the nature of matter, material objects were thought to be shadowy and partial resemblances of the preëxisting pattern, and to be changing, unsteady, and unreal. When these objects in the physical world came into relation to the senses, they were supposed to call into consciousness, with more or less distinctness, the reminiscence of the substantial forms of the world of real being.

Laying aside the doctrine of preëxistence as inconsistent with revelation, this theory of knowledge was widely adopted by Christian writers, and has retained its powerful hold of the human mind in the speculation of every subsequent age. These two theories of the origin of knowledge, intermingled with each other and modified in a thousand ways, have never been utterly lost sight of. Generally speaking, in modern

times, necessary concepts, have been assigned an origin in some way accordant with the Platonic, and contingent knowledge, with the Peripatetic system. In the majority of cases, the object of thought actually in relation with the mind, was conceived to be somewhat numerically distinct, from the mind. The polemic of Locke against the existence of innate ideas, in the form in which he understood Descartes and his followers to affirm their existence, showed the absurdity of supposing ideas or forms of thought to exist in the mind anterior to any action of the intellect upon the material given through the senses. The *a priori* elements in the mind are now generally spoken of as regulative principles of the mind's activity, inherent in its constitution, known intuitively, when the soul becomes observant of its own processes upon the subject matter given in sense. Though the theory of forms existing in the mind, numerically distinct from it, had vanished from the field of strictly metaphysical inquiry, it still held a precarious and doubtful empire in the philosophy of perception. It was to the work of laying the ghost of these defunct theories of human knowledge, that Hamilton addressed himself. Reid had begun the work before him, but had not comprehended the subtlest form of that representative hypothesis which he designed to destroy. It survived his attacks, while the theory of consciousness adopted by him and his disciple Stewart, which referred our knowledge of the objective and the subjective elements given in the act of perception, to different faculties of the mind, left the theory of immediate knowledge, which they were desirous to establish, open to attack, and even subjected both to the charge of holding themselves, one form of the representative theory. Brown, whose brilliant, acute, but incautious mind had seized upon this interpretation of the Psychology of Reid and Stewart, boldly laid the foundations of a new idealism, which needed nothing but the intrepid logic of some Fichte or Hume, to bring it into light. Brown, by his flippant treatment of the great masters of Scottish thought, and his meretricious rhetoric, disgusted the more thoughtful and sober of his contemporaries. His early death, and the publication of his Lectures, gave Hamilton a chance

for a criticism of the rash critic, and a defence and supplementation of the system of Natural Realism, which it had been the life labor of Reid to establish, against the Idealism of Collier and Berkley, and the Nihilism of Hume. It was in his criticism of Brown's Lectures, published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1830, that Hamilton first enounced those views on the Philosophy of Perception, which, taken in connection with his criticism of Cousin, constitute his title to the position of a great philosopher.

His first object was to admit and correct the faulty analysis by which Reid and Stewart were logically compelled to allow that all knowledge is subjective, and that matter cannot come within the sphere of consciousness. This analysis of consciousness into a special faculty of the mind, conversant alone with mental states, exclusive of those objective material realities which limit and determine its activity, was almost a justification of the interpretation of Brown, as well as of the charge of logical inconsequence and shallowness, which had been brought against the Scotch Philosophy by Continental writers. He then, by an examination of questions involved in the origin of empirical knowledge, and a careful induction and classification of the various theories of that origin which had been adopted, drew out a scheme involving all forms of the doctrine of representative perception which the nature of the conditions rendered possible, and gave quotations from Reid's works, showing that he had intended to reject them all. He then admits that Reid had failed to understand and characterize, that form of the representative hypothesis, which makes the representing entity in perception to be, not, a semi-material image, or an immaterial form existing in the substance of the mind, but a modification of the mind itself, superinduced by the material object, but non-existent out of consciousness. By reason of his failure to recognize this subtlest form of the representative hypothesis, he admits also that Reid had been in fault, and had laid himself open to misrepresentation; but that Reid, in spirit and intention, was a Natural Realist, in the sense that Hamilton proceeds to explain, he insists most earnestly. Laying aside some ambiguous and inconsistent

statements, to which we shall allude as we proceed, Hamilton's theory of Natural Realism may be described somewhat as follows.

A plain man lays his hand upon a piece of marble; he knows it as a hard and extended body, in relation to his organism, physical and mental. In knowing this body he knows himself, as, knowing it. The knowledge, is of a relation between himself and the thing known. Being conscious of this relation, he is of necessity conscious of the two terms constituting the relation, for the knowledge of relatives is one. While he knows himself and the object, he discriminates the one from the other. Consciousness in affirming the knowledge, affirms the unlikeness of the terms of the relation. What knows, is denied to be what is known, and what is known, is denied to be what knows. Here he has the fundamental antithesis and discrimination, which is the root of all knowledge. If he reflects, and chooses to philosophize, he may ask, When, did I know this object? If untaught in psychological theories, he will answer just what consciousness affirms, I knew it *when* I touched it. No analysis, no keenness of observation, no experiment, no torture, can wring from consciousness any other answer. The knowledge commenced with the relation between the object and the organism. He goes further with his inquiries. Where, did I know the marble? Consciousness has already given her testimony: I knew the object at the point of contact; where my nerves were compressed by the impact of the body. These are the answers which Nature gives to those who make of her an honest inquiry. If we propose to make consciousness the basis of our Psychology at all, we must accept these answers as truth. In fact, the reality of these deliverances has never been practically denied. The question arises, whether there are counter facts, of authority sufficient to set these affirmations of consciousness aside. If not, then they must stand, and that philosophy grounded in consciousness must stand with them.

Perhaps the most common objection to the doctrine of immediate perception, is found in the ordinary physiological explanation of the relative functions of the nerves and the

brain. This relation, in its main features, has been known since the time of Galen, but the notion that the brain is the *exclusive* organ of the mind, is of comparatively modern origin. The effect of severing a nerve of sensation has been supposed to prove that the office of the nerve fibres, so far as sensation is concerned, is simply and only physical. It has been assumed, that the relation of knowledge takes place in the brain, between a physical impulse which has been carried by the nerves from the point of contact with the outward object to the brain, the exclusive organ of the mind. The fact that the severance or compression of a nerve of sensation produces numbness in the part below, is admitted by all. But that this proves all action outside of the brain to be physical only, and that no part of the nervous tissue is directly used by the mind, except the brain, is another matter. It is plain, on a moment's reflection, that this is not, relatively to the doctrine assumed, an *experimentum crucis*. It admits as readily of explanation, on the theory that the mind, under certain limitations, uses the whole nervous tissue, as on the theory that it uses a part of it, the brain. The nervous tissue is an organic whole; when a part of it is cut off, that part becomes, relatively to the organized and living part, as a piece of dead or foreign matter. Consequently the mind, on the supposition that it is present to the nerve as it is to the brain, can use it no further than it extends as an organic whole, and a part of the connected and living tissue. It sustains to the part cut off, the same relation that it does to a portion of the brain, which may have been removed by a surgeon in the case of an injury. The mind, in numberless cases of this sort, is found to discharge its functions as before, but not through the part of the organism which has been removed. It is evident that the experiment in question can be accounted for just as readily on one theory as on the other. The real purport of the experiment, is to furnish proof of the intimate relation of the nerves of sensation with each other and the brain, which connects and unifies them all. It does not prove that physical sensations are carried up by nerves to the brain, but, rather, that the mind uses the various nerves directly for the acquisition of special kinds of knowl-

edge, and that the kind of knowledge which the nerves of each sense acquire, is determined by the adaptation of their form to receive impressions from various classes of external objects. Every difficulty which can be urged against this full admission of the facts of consciousness, drawn from the spatial relations of the mind to all the parts of the sensitive organism, can be urged with equal force against the theory which supposes the mind to be in immediate relation to the brain alone. The precise mode in which mind stands in relation to matter, is doubtless beyond our power to determine. It is not Hamilton's design, in assuming what he does, to set forth any such theory. It is only to vindicate the truth of the simple datum of consciousness, that the mind *is* where it manifests itself. When it manifests itself as knowing, at the point of contact with the outward world, he would accept the deliverance of consciousness in its integrity. Upon this he takes his stand, and discusses the mode in which some physiologists have attempted to set the authority of consciousness aside, only that he may show its inadequacy and failure. This doctrine, which may seem to some readers of Hamilton to be novel, is the old, and it may almost be said, general, theory. We have lying before us a series of citations from ancient and modern authors, which, taken in connection with those referred to by Hamilton, presents a formidable array of theologians, metaphysicians, and physiologists, all coinciding in our author's interpretation of the affirmations of consciousness in perception.

Another element in the system, is the recognition of the several senses as being so many modifications of the single sense of touch. This doctrine, as old as Democritus, will be readily admitted. Cœnæsthesis, or the vague common feeling of existence, must be the basis of all distinct and specialized sensation. As we examine the animal kingdom, in its stages of progress from the lower animals toward man, we find a constantly increasing differentiation of the nervous matter, the organ of this common feeling, into nerve-fibres and special senses, all of them reducible to the common element, touch. The optic nerve is specialized to touch light; the auditory nerve, to touch the vibrations of the sound-wave; the olfac-

tory nerve, to touch odors. Each of these senses has this in common with the others, and with touch, that it is fitted to come into direct and immediate relation with the peculiar objects it was designed to cognize. This simple analysis gives us the basis for the limitations, under which we speak of immediate knowledge in perception. The mind has an intuitive and direct knowledge of the sound-wave, but not of the bell or gong, which is the proximate cause of its being set in motion. Its knowledge of the cause, of the intuitively known effect, is indirect or inferential. The same may be said of odors. The only serious difficulty in this analysis occurs in the case of vision, and this is rather seeming than real. Every one knows that the eye has no natural power of itself, to become cognizant of bodies. The most uneducated person recognizes light as a physical medium, distinct from the body which reflects it, on the one hand, and from the eye on the other. Every one who has had experience of the alternations of day and night, is aware that what the eye immediately knows, or what actually comes into relation with it, is light. The question, how light causes us to know the objects from which it is reflected, is one that it is impossible to answer. But however this may be, it is a question of Physics, rather than of Psychology. Assuming that in vision we come into immediate relation to light of different colors, it follows that, as we become cognizant of the variously colored patches of light which differently constituted bodies reflect, we know these showers of reflected rays, or patches of color, distinctly separate from each other, as they come from their several reflecting surfaces, and, when refracted by the lenses of the eye, reach the retina. Each reflecting surface is, by the laws of light, discriminated by means of the spots of different colored light on the retina, the meeting of the different colors forming the outlines of the figure. Thus it comes to pass, that we see figures of two dimensions, in relative size and form, directly and intuitively described and limited, in the various colored rays which actually touch the eye. It seems to us that Hamilton might have extended the statement that we have direct knowledge through the eye, of extension in two dimensions, to the per-

ception in certain cases of horizontal distance. We would make no objection to the doctrine common since Berkley, that our estimate of the distance of an object seen through a transparent medium, with no object intervening, is inferential alone. But in the vast majority of cases such objects do actually intervene, and we think it may be shown that if extension in two dimensions is seen directly, by the eye, the same under certain limitations must be true of horizontal distances. A man looking at a distant object upon an extended plane surface, upon which he himself stands, may include in his field of view all, or a portion of the plane between himself and the object. Consequently the line on the plane, measuring the distance between the limit of the observer's field of view next himself and the object, will be projected on the retina. By the law of projection, the length of this projected line will vary with the size of the angle formed by the plane surface, supposed to be between the observer and the object, and the observer's line of vision. When the observer's eye is very near the plane, the line projected on the retina will be reduced in length in the same proportion. When the eye is on a level with this plane, and the angle formed by it and the line of vision is reduced to zero, then the line of projection becomes a point, and we have no means of making even a relative determination of the distance of the object. As the eye of the observer is raised above the plane, and the angle which it forms with the line of sight becomes sensible, the line which projects the distance of the object from the observer, or the limit of the field of view nearest himself, becomes larger and larger, until the line of sight comes to be at right angles with the plane surface, and the observer's eye, occupies a position above the assumed plane surface, equidistant from the object and the place first occupied by the observer, or the original limit of the field of view next to him while in his former position. In this event the case becomes one of the simple apprehension of a straight line connecting two points. The power thus to apprehend the line in question involves the power to apprehend the surface on which it is drawn. Hence, if we admit the direct knowledge

of extension in two dimensions by the eye at all, we must, under the limitations which we have explained, admit direct knowledge of a certain space between the body of the observer and a distant object. It will be seen that the example we have stated may be generalized, and made to cover every case wherein a plane surface capable of reflecting light, intervenes between the object and the eye, and makes a sensible angle with the line of the observer's sight. The power of making allowance for the variations of the angle, the size of which determines the length of the line projected on the retina, and comparing the result with a given unit of measure, depends, of course, upon judgment, and is acquired by experience.

With these explanations, it is evident that the standing examples which are brought forward to prove the deceptive character of the sense of sight, and thereby to disprove natural realism, have no relevancy whatever. I look at a stick thrust diagonally into water. It appears to me bent; not because my sense deceives me, but because it does not. My sense advertises me of the exact conditions under which the light comes into relation with it. A seaman sees a ship or a headland looming in a fog, but he never attributes the phenomenon to the deceptive action of the sense, but to the fog.

Thus, we see that the root of all actual knowledge is found in the intuitions of the sense, affirming that the object of these intuitions actually *is*, and also holds a direct and immediate relation to the organism. All other knowledge is indirect and inferential, and however certain and real it may be, it becomes such through the agency of physical media, which themselves are the objects of intuitive apprehension.

These general distinctions, requisite as limitations of a doctrine of natural realism, are set forth by Hamilton through the analysis of the qualities of matter into primary, secondary, and secundo-primary. We prefer to present the subject as we have, for the purpose of simplicity and clearness. The analysis of the qualities of body made by Hamilton, displays, in a high degree, his acuteness in making distinctions, but it seems to us to give a less clear idea of the necessary limitations of natural realism, than the simple division of knowledge

into that which is direct, intuitive, and immediate, and that which is mediate, inferential, or indirect. The distinction between these two kinds of knowledge is obvious, it being substantially the same as that commonly given by Psychologists, separating direct, and acquired perceptions. The analysis of the qualities of body into primary, secondary, and secundo-primary, besides being extremely complicated in result, and difficult of application, is in great part, if not entirely, conversant with facts and modes belonging to Physics, rather than to Psychology. To call sound, a quality of a vibrating body, is, in any legitimate sense of the term, a misnomer, and tends to confuse the mind, inasmuch as it puts into the same class, and gives the same name, to the objects of mediate and immediate knowledge. Indeed, Hamilton himself, in one of his supplementary Dissertations, admits the impropriety of this application of the term. If we mistake not, the classification of light, sound, and odor, as qualities of body, was originally determined by confused notions of the physical conditions to which they were due. In inquiries of this nature, nothing tends more strongly to confusion and error, than the equivocal use of terms, and the failure to mark, sharply, the distinction between Psychology and Physics.

We may be permitted to draw attention, in passing, to the statements of our author, regarding what he calls “the *purely subjective character* of the secondary qualities, as apprehended.” To illustrate the case, we will suppose an odor, or sound-wave, to be perceived. He tells us that, in these cases, there is “an objective quality supposed, but not perceived;” that a “subject-object is the only object of the cognition;” that the apprehensions of the secondary qualities are “sensations, not perceptions.” These passages, taken in their obvious meaning, affirm, that in knowing sounds or odors, there is no non-ego discriminated from the ego at all; hence, also, that our knowledge of them is purely subjective—a mode of mind alone—which gives us no affirmation whatever of an external reality. If there be no discrimination of an external object from the knowing subject, there is no means of discriminating the mental processes under discussion from acts

of imagination. He affirms, however, that, from these purely subjective affections, their causes, which he calls secondary qualities, "are inferred and conceived as possible." Now, these subjective sensations cannot become signs, such as will compel us to infer an external, material cause, unless they are accompanied, at the same instant, by a perception—vague and indistinct it may be, but still a perception—of an external object, actively affecting the organism. We say of strong light, that it *strikes* the eye. In so saying, we describe the sudden collision of an external object with the organ. The action of a sound-wave upon the ear, is often so intense as to destroy the tympanum. It strikes the organ, and is perceived to be external to the organism as really as the rain which beats upon a traveler's face in a storm. Place a vial of ammonia beneath the nostrils, and we are as really percipient of a non-ego as if pricked by a bundle of needles. Without doubt, in coming into relation with these attenuated forms of matter, our perception of the object becomes more and more indistinct, as sounds become faint, or the odorous particles reaching the nerve, or the rays of light impinging on a given surface of the retina, become fewer; but we believe that, so long as there is a sensible affection of the nerves, there is a perception of an external object, distinct in proportion to the intensity of the external conditions of the sensible affection that are present to the organ. There are physical limits to the susceptibility of our nerves to the more attenuated forms of matter, but within those limits, and whenever the nerves are sensibly affected, we believe that some degree, of knowledge of the external impinging object really takes place. Very many questions are suggested by this discussion regarding the physical constitution of what are called imponderable substances; but, though they have a certain relation to the subject in hand, it is not a vital one, and we pass them by.

From the nature of the results at which our author arrives regarding presentative knowledge in perception, it follows, as a matter of course, that memory and imagination must be conversant with representations, as opposed to presentative intuitions. As they rest on the basis of intuitions of which

the mind has had experience in the past, the representations only, of these intuitions can be present to the mind in memory and imagination. Though we would not make Hamilton responsible for what we are about say, memory may be defined as the power by which we are able, under certain limitations, to reproduce in the present, the state of mind and body in which we were, at the time of our having become percipient of a given fact in the past. As all our mental action is under the conditions of space and time, or, in other words, through the presence of intuitions of sense, or some image, sign, or word, which represents past intuitions, or embodies the general concepts which we may have formed of them, it follows that, in every form of thought, there must be present to the mind some elements of sense perceptions in the character of signs. These signs, thus originated, are the necessary conditions of holding and comparing ideas. Every word must be a material product, in order to be available as a sign. This is true, whether the word be written, or uttered, or imaged in the memory, and we are compelled, under these limitations, to recognize in all our mental processes the reality of the two worlds of matter and mind. In all thinking, we recognize the sign as representing the reality, originally given in consciousness from the external world, and we necessarily discriminate from the sign of material origin, the ego or thinking subject, and reäffirm the reality of the distinction between the two. So marvellous and all-pervading are the laws of thought, that, in every possible analysis of human thinking, we find the refutation of idealism and materialism—the voice of the Almighty affirming the reality of mind, and the reality of matter, the basis of all sound thought in Philosophy, Morals, and Religion.

We are able, from what has been said, to form a definite notion of the real distinction between sensation and perception. In the Philosophy of Reid and Stewart, these were represented as separate, very much according to the theory of the Cartesians. Sensation was not considered as an act coëtaneous with perception, but as merely the outward occasion upon which an idea was caused to appear in the mind,

by some sort of mystical process, or the concurrence of some hyperphysical agency. In accordance with the views here given, it will be seen that sensation and perception, are names for the bodily and mental sides of the same indivisible process. Mind and body actually come into relation with the things known, at the same moment of time. The bodily side or the mental side may predominate in a given case, but so long as there is no lesion, or compression of the nerves, so as to produce numbness or fainting, neither of the two elements can be reduced to zero—they must coëxist. Regarding the comparative potency of these coëxistent activities of mind and body, which we call sensation and perception, Sir William enounces the law that the distinctness of each, is in an inverse ratio to that of the other. While admitting, what must be obvious, that when the attention is absorbed by extreme bodily pain, the part affected is, under ordinary circumstances, less available for the attainment of knowledge, we are not prepared to admit the universal and necessary existence of this mathematical ratio. When the mind is powerfully excited, or the will under high tension, mere bodily pain does not reduce our capacity to obtain knowledge, in any perceptible degree. Ordinarily, we should lose much of our power to obtain knowledge by touch, if the nerve were exposed, without protection from the skin. But if the salvation of life depended upon obtaining knowledge with such an organ, the pain would be scarcely felt, and would hardly interfere at all with the distinctness of our perception. Ordinarily, thinking is impossible in connection with intense bodily pain, but a vigorous will can overcome the hindrance.

In opposition to the views of Stewart, Hamilton affirms the possibility of becoming cognizant, by sight, of more than one object at a time. In his reasoning on this subject, he follows very closely the course of thought adopted by Fearn, in his *Essay on Consciousness*, who, it must be confessed, successfully opposed the conclusions of Stewart. Hamilton has added little to the conclusive criticism of this acute but eccentric thinker. It seems to us, that Stewart's conclusions on this subject can only be accounted for, on the assumption that he

failed to distinguish the mental facts of which we are conscious in the process of attention and critical observation, from those which take place spontaneously on directing the eye to a series of small objects lying before us.

We pass, without special notice, the discussion of latent mental processes, in which our author adopts the view of Leibnitz and Kant, in opposition to those of Stewart. It is sufficient to say, that there are various mental phenomena, the details of which elude our observation, but which must be supposed to have taken place from the result, of which we have knowledge. These facts may be explained, by assuming that the supposed processes were entirely latent, taking place out of consciousness, and in a mode apart from all analogy to ordinary mental activity. This explanation is adopted by Hamilton. On the other hand, it may be assumed that the processes in question have taken place normally in consciousness, but, from the rapidity of the movement, or the slightness of the impression made, the fact has failed to be registered in memory. This is the theory adopted by Stewart. It would take more space than we can spare, to examine the facts, in detail, upon which each philosopher founds his hypothesis. With our present means of knowledge, we see no advantage which the Leibnitzian explanation can claim over that of Stewart, while it is incumbered with serious difficulties, to which the other is not obnoxious. Confessedly, there are few actual facts to appeal to, for a decision, and each mode of explanation must be considered hypothetical.

But we must leave the discussion of details, however interesting to the student of these topics, and proceed to the examination of some few statements, definitions, and conclusions in these Lectures, and elsewhere in Hamilton's works, that seem to us inconsistent with that doctrine of Perception which in general he sets forth with such marvellous vigor and clearness.

In the first place, let us inquire into the purport of our author's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge. The statement that all our knowledge is relative only, is repeated in so many forms that we may suppose it to be a cardinal point in

his system. One quotation will suffice: "Our whole knowledge of mind and matter, is then, as we have said, only relative; of existence, absolutely and in itself, we know nothing."—[Lect. 7th, p. 97.] Now, there are some difficulties which strike the mind at once, in reading this passage. If we are told that we can have no knowledge of any object which does not come within the sphere of our several faculties, we can easily understand what is meant. We cannot know light, except it touches the eye, nor the ærial vibrations which produce the effect we call sound, except they touch or come into relation with the ear. Moreover, we understand that only *so much* of any given object can be known, as comes into relation to the faculties. A cannon ball lies before me. It comes into certain relations to my mind, but these are few and unimportant, in comparison with those relations into which it can come to the mind of a chemist like Faraday or Liebig. My knowledge, though partial, compared with theirs, is just as real and as positive. God exists in all possible relations to all possible objects; hence, as a being, we say his knowledge is absolute, or complete. But my knowledge of the few objects which, in a few of their aspects, come into relation to my mind, is real, though extremely partial in amount. Consequently, I know something real, of the cannon ball that lies before me. We shall find further information on this subject, when we ask the meaning of the assertion so constantly iterated by Hamilton, that of "matter in itself," or of "existence in itself," we know absolutely nothing. Does he mean to affirm that I "know nothing" of the cannon ball, "in itself?" My consciousness affirms that I do know something of the actual ball, "in itself." Though he uses the most general terms, such as "matter" and "existence," in his formulas, we have a right to conclude that whatever is affirmed or denied of the class "matter," or "existence," is affirmed or denied of all the things included under the class. Now, the cannon ball is "matter," and has "existence." Moreover, I cannot separate it from itself, even in thought. It cannot exist "in itself," and out of itself, at the same time. Hence, if I do not know, the ball actually, directly, presentatively, and "in itself," I

do not know it at all, and natural realism is swallowed up with the denial. Again, if we suppose our author to represent, by the phrases "matter in itself," or "the cannon ball in itself," its inner physical constitution, or the form of its ultimate atoms, we can admit our ignorance on that point, without being compelled to acknowledge that we know absolutely nothing, of the piece of matter in question. Between the completed knowledge of the Almighty, concerning the constitution and mode of existence of the cannon ball, and the limited knowledge which I possess, there is a vast difference. But it does not follow from this, that I have no knowledge at all. I do know something of its constitution and mode of existence, and can confidently discriminate it from wood, or stone, or lead. We are driven to the conclusion that, in adopting the phrase "matter in itself," and "things in themselves," and affirming our ignorance of what they denote, Hamilton may be justly charged with using them in the Kantian sense. All know that the phrases were used by Kant, to set forth a system of purely subjective knowledge, and that in his system their meaning is unequivocal, and holds a vital relation to a consistent terminology, which, in all its parts, is absolutely exclusive of anything like natural realism. That Sir William has thus been drawn into the outer currents, at least, of the maelstrom of the Kantian dialectic, will further appear, when we examine his use of the terms "phenomenon" and "quality," as correlative and antithetical to the phrase "matter in itself."

In his second Dissertation, appended to the Philosophy of the Conditioned, he writes as follows: "Of things absolutely, or in themselves, be they external, be they internal, we know nothing, or know them as incognizable, and we become aware of their incomprehensible existence only as this is indirectly and accidentally revealed to us through certain qualities, related to our faculties of knowledge. *
* * * * All that we know, is, therefore, *phenomenal*—*phenomenal* of the unknown." In his Seventh Lecture, page 97, he says: "It is only in its qualities, only in its effects in its relative or phenomenal existence, that it [matter] is

"cognizable or conceivable, and it is only by a law of thought, "which compels us to think something absolute and unknown "as the basis or condition of the relative and known, that this "something obtains a kind of incomprehensible reality to us."

These forms of expression are almost identical with those of Kant bearing on the same subject, and distinctly grounded in a system of representationism of the most unequivocal character. In connection with the first passage quoted, Hamilton cites the following sentence from Kant, as illustrative and confirmatory of his own views: "In perception, every thing is known in conformity to the constitution of our own faculty." This passage, as every one familiar with the system will see, is a recognition of the idea fundamental in Kant, that phenomena, in perception are mere representations in the understanding of the unknown noumena or things in themselves, and that these phenomena are products, of an unrelated, formless content in the sense, which, when modified by the subjective laws of thought, elaborated into ideas, are no longer exact representations of the external realities, as they actually exist. The outward world, as it really exists, is thus represented by phenomena which *ex-hypothesi* not only have their existence apart from the reality, but have been themselves modified and changed from their original, as a content of the sense, by the plastic agency of the subjective mental forces. Hamilton seems to have been so far misled by the terminology and influence of the great German, as to recognize as true that false analysis which, in the *process of sensible perception*, separates in time or space the phenomenon from the matter which actually *is*, and whose actual presence to the mind *is* the phenomenon. This false analysis assumes it to be possible for the mind to know, in the intuitions of sense and intellect combined, a phenomenon or quality, without knowing, at the same instant and in the same mode, the material substance which appears and exists in such or such a relation to the mind. Now, quality, in respect to matter, is merely a term naming a given relation of a real object to the mind. The word phenomenon, in physical science, denotes a fact to be explained or reduced to law; in the philosophy

of perception, it denotes, properly, any given part of a material object, which is in direct relation to our faculties. Apart from the thing which *is*, and is in relation to the mind, phenomena or qualities have no existence, except as abstract concepts in the thought—the *entia rationis* of the schools. But, in the Kantian sense, the term phenomenon, when used relatively to sensible perception, denotes an impression made upon the senses, such as we are said to represent it to ourselves after it has been manipulated by the forms of the sensibility and the categories of the understanding. After this process, it becomes the permanent possession of the intellect; but it is to be distinguished broadly from the “thing in itself,” or noumenon, which is assumed always to remain in a sort of lofty isolation, affirmed to be, as the unknown cause of the phenomenon, which itself has been modified and elaborated, till it has lost its right to be taken as a copy of its unknown father.

We would repudiate, term and thing, this shadowy Teutonic phenomenon, as nothing more or less than the intelligible species of the schoolmen, and as involving in itself the germ of that Idealism which the logic of Fichte developed, and of that Pan-egoism which, alternated with Pan-theism, Mr. Emerson deals out in infinitesimal doses to his bewildered and admiring disciples. When Hamilton addresses himself definitely to the exposition of Natural Realism, we find nothing of this illegitimate terminology; but when he comes to deal with the Continental Absolutists who affirm the omniscience of the human intellect, he seems ready to sacrifice even that real, knowledge of real, things which he has so powerfully vindicated to the human mind, if thereby he may the more effectually crush and grind to powder that pretentious absolutism which, with lofty scorn, he delivers over to shame and everlasting contempt. In the battle of the giants, which he waged with Cousin and Schelling, he seized the weapons which Kant had forged. They are dangerous and deceitful weapons to the advocate of Natural Realism. Like the Australian Boomerang, they return again to him who hurls them, but not always to fall harmless at his feet. The powerful subjectivism of Kant is a logical whole, crystalized into a terminology marvel-

lous for adaptation to its purposes, and the coherence of its parts. It has no points of agreement with an inductive philosophy of consciousness, nor will it be tampered with by coy suitors. It must be taken as a whole, or not at all. We have limited ourselves to Hamilton's Psychology, and we must avoid the attractive field of his Metaphysics, with the simple record of the impression that in these deviations from the consistent holding and advocacy of Natural Realism, will be found the weakest points of his, in the main, unanswerable argument against the Absolutists of the Continent. Just here, also, as we venture to predict, will his enthusiastic and unquestioning disciples, be likely to fail in their attempts to follow out and apply the system of their master. The best results of Hamilton's reply to the absolutists may be retained, the limitations of human knowledge stated and proximately defined, without reducing that knowledge to zero, and leaving, as the ultimate product of finite thinking, a system of philosophical know-nothingism, or a body of postulates, forever swinging, pendulum-like, between opposite contradictories.

As we know matter, appearing, extended, modified, existing in such or such relations to our organisms, so, we know mind. Our knowledge of it is not confined to mere concepts, which have no real existence out of our thought, called phenomena, or modes, or qualities, but we have a direct and immediate knowledge of mind *as* acting, knowing, suffering—as self-approving or self-condemning. Our knowledge of the constitution of mind is very limited, but we know from the fundamental antithesis of consciousness that it is not matter. We know matter *as* extended, hard, heavy—as of this or that form; so in like manner we know mind, *as* willing, suffering, knowing, judging. By the knowledge which we thus acquire, we are able to discriminate and classify the kinds of each, as well as the different states or forms, in which we know them, as existing. We thus form a real science of mind, and a real science of matter. Our knowledge is partial, but no man may say that it is not real. Making all proper allowances for human weakness, ignorance, and error, every man knows something, of mind and something, of matter, *as* each actually is. The terminology of Kant regarding mind, names a system which denies

immediate knowledge of self, as well as of the not self; hence his consistency, when he affirms that we know nothing of "mind in itself," but only phenomena, of which the *ego* is an unknown noumenon, or, in fact, a mere logical concept or tie, connecting the fugitive phenomena with each other. But Sir William's natural Realism affirms and requires a presentative knowledge of self, as the correlative conditioning element of the presentative and immediate knowledge of matter. We admit that this mode of expression is not peculiar to Kant or Hamilton, but is found in nearly all the English treatises of Psychology as well. The idea which underlies it, is one of the remnants of the Logical Realism of the middle ages, which supposes the existence of a material substance, which is neither hard or soft, extended, shaped, heavy, or colored—a something indescribable, in which qualities inhere, or, in simple English, into which they are stuck, like so many quills in a porcupine. It is one of the continually recurring instances wherein a logical entity is confounded with a real existence in space and time. It has had its latest apotheosis in the identification of thought and being in the intellectual monstrosities of Hegel, and its most worthy refutation in Swift's Tale of a Tub. A modification of the notion of substance, is quite common, which, when analyzed, is identical with the notion of cause. An object is contemplated in its relations. The mind asks, How did this object come to exist? If it is a work of art, we refer its existence to the artist. If it is a mere mass of crude matter, we still may ask the same question, and also the additional one, What causes it to continue to exist? The answer to this question is found in the idea of a cause; not in the idea of a special one, for each object or class, but in the cause of causes, the self-existing, unchanging *substance*. This notion of substance is clearly connected with that of the first cause, and has no analogy to the scholastic idea we have described above. Another meaning in which the term is used still remains. I look upon a material object. I know that it *is*—that it *exists*. Examining it, I find that it exists in various modes, while continuing the same thing. That, in the object which continues unchanged, while the modes of its existence vary, I name substance. I know the same substance or exist-

ence under different modes or forms. So far is this existent thing or substance, from being unknown, that it is the very thing which is modified, and I know as such. When we say that a mode or quality necessitates the thought of a substance, we mean that a mode or quality, when spoken of in perception, is known, and can be known, only in, and as, a manifestation of a real body or thing, which exists as substance, capable of taking on various modes.

When in thought we abstract from bodies as existing in space and time, the notion which we have of them in common—*i. e.*, that they all exist—we form in thought the concept of *existence*, or *substance*, equally predicable of each and all. In like manner, when we think of all the individual modes, in which substances can exist, we collect them in one term, as a concept, which we call mode, or quality, or phenomenon. The same relation which we recognize between singular modes and substances, existing as individuals, we affirm to exist between the general concepts of substance and quality. Each of these concepts represents a class, and, of course, the relations of the classes must be determined by the relations of the individuals under them. The individual substance, or existence, is known in, and with, its modes in the act of perception; the general concepts of substance and quality, are not known as singular existences in perception at all, for the simple reason that they are beings of the intellect, existing not as individuals but only as they are *thought*. Perhaps the confusion of the singular affirmation of substance with the general concept, may be often accounted for from the fact that the singular idea contains no more than each of the several individuals collected in the general concept, the species and individuals actually forming the genus, being in all respects similar. The classification being made without any abstraction of superfluous elements, the difference between the import of the singular, and general terms, is only that between a single individual and a collection, all exactly similar. In like manner the distinction between a singular mode or quality, and the general concept including a number of the same, has been lost sight of and forgotten. By keeping these distinctions in mind, we think

it possible to show that both substance and quality, in their indissoluble relation, can be known in perception by immediate knowledge, while we leave the general concepts of each to hold their legitimate place in language and logic, and vindicate to the human mind a knowledge of matter "in itself," under the obvious limitations which we have heretofore suggested. This same analysis of the relation of substance and quality into singular existences and general concepts, may be applied, with a little modification, to mind. In affirmation of the doctrine that we know self in its modes and qualities immediately, we have the high authority of Mr. Mansel. In his *Prolegomena Logica*, p. 300, he says, the "denial of the immediate consciousness of self," is the "fundamental error" of Kant. The baneful results of presuming that *modes* of self are intuitively known, while direct consciousness of self is denied, are obvious. The skepticism regarding matter, which lurks in the system of Kant, manifests itself with equal distinctness in the sphere of mind. A natural realism which admits the immediate consciousness of self, and not self, in both mode and substance, at the same time, furnishes the only solid foundation of evidence, in Physics, Morals, and Religion. With all our reverence for the genius and learning of Hamilton, we cannot follow him one inch away from the foundations which he himself has laid. His Natural Realism we can accept with thankfulness; but that Continental subjectivism with which he has sought to unite it, we would reject without reserve or condition.

In the conclusion of our article, though not of the discussion, we may be permitted to express the conviction, which a somewhat extended study of the works of Hamilton has impressed upon us, that, for a gymnastic of the mind, for a stimulus to vigorous thinking, for exact definition and breadth of view, they are unsurpassed in the literature of Philosophy. He who differs in opinion from Hamilton, will find his best preparation for criticism, in giving his days and nights to the study of the works, from whose conclusions he would record his dissent. It is not too much to say, that, since the death Immanuel Kant, no greater name has adorned the commonwealth of letters.

ARTICLE II.—RIVES'S LIFE OF MADISON.

History of the Life and Times of James Madison. By WILLIAM C. RIVES. Volume I. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1859.

THE Lives of the first three Presidents of the United States have already been wrought into the permanent literature of the country. Washington—whose character is the choicest heritage of the American people—has been worthily celebrated by the appreciative pen of his distinguished friend, Chief Justice Marshall; again by the patient and faithful industry of President Sparks; and still later by the graceful genius of Washington Irving, who has devoted to the most illustrious name of American history, the noblest labor of a long life consecrated, to its lamented close, to American literature. Adams has found a discriminating and admiring biographer in his accomplished grandson, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, who has also edited the works of his distinguished ancestor. Jefferson, more careful than either of his fame with posterity, has, perhaps more fully than either, been portrayed to the people. The Biographies of his nephew, Mr. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, prefixed to his papers; of Professor George Tucker, and more recently of Mr. Henry S. Randall, have done for him all that a statesman could ask from the literature of his country.

In the work whose initial volume is now before us, Mr. Madison, the fourth in the succession of American Presidents, is placed before us in a biography that in literary and historical value, promises to compare favorably with the best of those which have been dedicated to his predecessors. It is from the pen of one of the most accomplished and national of our living statesmen; one who has distinguished himself in the service of his country, both at home and abroad, and is now

devoting the evening of an active and studious life to the historical portraiture of "the man who contributed more largely and effectively, though unobtrusively, to the formation of the institutions under which we live, than any of his contemporaries." The present volume, partly perhaps from the Virginia position of its author, is devoted, in an unusual degree, to the historical scenes and events amidst which Mr. Madison was so conspicuous an actor. Indeed, Mr. Rives himself speaks of it as belonging rather "to the department of History than of Biography, though partaking of the character of both;" and it has been objected to the volume, that it is rather a history of the age than a biography of the man. For ourselves, however, we do not object to this feature in Mr. Rives's plan. It is, to a certain extent at least, indispensable to a full exhibition of the character he is portraying, and, at the same time, adds to the richness and value of the work as an exponent of the founding and the early development of our political institutions. The reader could not well spare from the volume the account which it contains of the struggles of religious freedom in Virginia, in which Mr. Madison bore so honorable a part; or the illustration it gives of the Revolutionary Congress, of which he was so conspicuous and useful a member. History and Biography are intimately and inseparably connected, and neither can be successfully written without constant reference to the other. Most of all is this true of the biographies of statesmen and rulers, for they are eminently historical characters; their counsels and acts are materials for history, and can be correctly narrated and fully exhibited only in the reflected light of the age to which they belong.

There is something unusually attractive in the early unfolding of the character of this Revolutionary Statesman. He was not, like many of his contemporaries, the mere child of the age, forced into conspicuous station and impelled to brilliant deeds by the events that were transpiring around him. He was rather a specimen of the best education and most liberal culture which could then be attained by the young men of America. His father, whose name he bore, was a Virginia gentleman of the old school, the owner and occupant of a

large rural plantation—devoted to agriculture, but fond of knowledge, and interested in all the political questions of the time. His mother was Elizabeth Conway, and in her character were illustrated the virtues and graces which we always look for in those who have given birth to men that are truly great. He was born in March, 1751, in the County of King George, though the home of his parents was some sixty miles distant, in the County of Orange. In 1769, at the age of eighteen, he entered Nassau Hall at Princeton, and there pursued his Academic education, under the supervision of that distinguished patriot and moralist, President Witherspoon. He received his degree at College in 1771—though he continued to reside for another year at Princeton, in order still further to prosecute his studies in preparation for life. He then returned to his father's house in Virginia, at the age of twenty-one—a modest and ingenuous young man—with a mind disciplined by the best education of the time, and a character adorned with manly virtues and energies, and animated with lofty and generous aspirations. He bore back with him an earnest love of study—that was quenched by no eagerness for immediate activity, and no itching for notoriety, but which found its highest gratification in the reading of books, amid the quiet of his rural home. He at this time studied History, Ethics, and Law, though he did not look forward to professional practice; he also gave his fullest energies to the investigation of the evidences of Christianity, and the development and application of its doctrines through the successive centuries of Christian history.

In the midst of liberal and ennobling pursuits like these, Mr. Madison prepared himself for large and clear views of those great questions respecting the rights of man and the nature of civil society, with which his age was already beginning to be agitated. Here he also acquired the rudiments of that pure English style, which afterwards became so important an instrument of his power, and so enduring a basis of his fame.

It was while he was thus dwelling in studious retirement at his father's house, that his attention was first called to the

despotic nature of the Church establishment, then appointed by law in Virginia. From the beginning of the Colony, the Church of England had been established there, and all the rigorous oppressions practiced in England for securing uniformity, had been in full operation in Virginia. The people of the Colony were, for the most part, members of the Anglican Church by hereditary descent, and were animated, to an unusual degree, with the spirit of contempt which an ecclesiastical establishment never fails to engender. On no class of non-conformists in Virginia, were these ecclesiastical oppressions visited with such relentless severity, as upon the Baptists of that age. They had established themselves in the Colony near the middle of the last century—later than in any other Colony then existing—and had rapidly increased in numbers, gathering their disciples, for the most part, from the humbler classes of society, but occasionally drawing into their ranks families of wealth and social position, and even of ecclesiastical distinction. For some cause or other—probably on account of their humble position, and their perpetual protests against a State religion—they soon brought upon themselves the special hate and persecution of the ruling classes throughout the Colony. Their ministers were refused the license to preach, which the law required for all whom it acknowledged. Their Churches were denounced as mere schismatic societies, and their meetings for worship as treasonable assemblies, which every body was permitted to molest, and the magistrates were required to disperse.

The history of the Baptists in Virginia, from 1760 to 1780, is a melancholy record of continual persecution. It is, however, also a record of continual growth, and furnishes a striking illustration of the effect of social hostility and legal proscription upon the propagation of a religious faith. In many parts of the Colony, their ministers were seldom permitted to preach without being molested in the midst of their service. They were insulted by the mob—they were arrested, and even scourged, by the magistrates—they were fined and imprisoned by the Courts: and the haughty Anglican Church, in this her favorite Colony in America, was as vindictive and

despotic as she had been a century before in the mother country, when ruled by the policy of the second Charles and the second James. Facts like these are scattered all over the humble annals of the Virginia Baptists during the period to which we have referred. They have never been narrated with the historic care and the graphic power which their importance, as a part of the struggle for religious freedom, really demands. Specimens of them, however, have been made familiar to the public, in works like Dr. Semple's History, Dr. Taylor's "*Lives of Virginia Ministers*," and in the recent volume of Dr. Sprague's "*American Pulpit*," which is devoted to the Baptists. Some of the venerable pioneers of our persecuted faith, who are mentioned in these volumes, were imprisoned several times during every year of their ministry. Rev. John Waller, distinguished among them for his superior education and his great energy of character, narrates in letters that have been preserved, instances in which six and eight of his brethren were imprisoned together in the jail of a single county. Scarcely less extraordinary was the experience of Samuel Harriss, of Lewis Craig, James Read, William Fristoe, and Lewis Lunsford, all of whom were natives of Virginia, and all of whom, as ministers of the gospel, repeatedly suffered the penalties of fine, imprisonment, and scourging, for asserting the faith which they cherished.

Persecutions like these did not fail to draw forth the condemnation of high-minded men in all parts of the Colony; but they were too generally regarded as the natural results of obstinacy and stupidity on the part of their victims. Nor were these oppressions confined to the Baptists alone. In one form or another, and with a rigor greater or less according to the circumstances, they were liable to be visited on all who dared to deviate from the dominant Church which the legislature had adopted and prescribed for the people. The prescription of Anglicanism was deemed necessary in Virginia, just as the prescription of Puritanism was deemed necessary in Massachusetts; and in either of these commonwealths, they who dissented from the faith which was appointed by law, could expect but slender sympathy, even from good and honorable men.

Mr. Madison, however, in the midst of his studies in ethics and jurisprudence, seems to have been thoroughly outraged at the instances of religious persecution which were constantly occurring around him. In his own County of Orange, men had been imprisoned for the crime of preaching the gospel without the license of law or the permission of the Church. He had attended the Courts at which they were tried, and had been a witness of the contempt and hostility with which they were treated; and that for no crime—for no moral delinquency, nor even for any errors of doctrine—but only for non-conformity. In January, 1774, he wrote a letter to his College friend, Mr. Bradford of Philadelphia, which proves that he had already risen superior to the standard of the age, and become a strong and rational adherent of absolute religious freedom. In this letter of familiar friendship, after adverting, in no complimentary style, to the character of too many of the representatives of the Church, both of the clergy and the laity, he writes: "There are at this time, in the adjacent county, not less than five or six well-meaning men in close jail, for publishing their religious sentiments, which in the main are very orthodox. I have neither patience to hear, talk, or think of anything relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed so long about it to little purpose, that I am without common patience. So I must beg you to pity me, and pray for liberty of conscience for all." In this brief extract we find the germ of the great idea which Mr. Madison carried with him into all his career as a maker of laws and a framer of constitutions, and which he at length had the happiness to see triumphing over the ecclesiastical establishment of his native State, and by his own exertions wrought forever into the very substance of her fundamental law.

But other events in the condition of the Colony were beginning still more to disturb the retirement of the young statesman-student, and still more to strengthen his principles and develop his character. Intelligence was received of the passage, by the British Parliament, of the Boston Port Bill, and the other famous acts of ministerial vengeance which characterized the accession to power of Lord North and his

administration. The cause of Puritan Massachusetts is immediately made the common cause of all the Colonies, and is espoused with especial earnestness by Anglican Virginia. Lord Dunmore, the governor, is soon driven from power, and the Colony remains for two years in a sort of suspense of legalized rule, directed for the most part by County Committees of Safety, and an annual Colonial Convention. Mr. Madison's earliest connection with public affairs appears to have been as a member of the Committee for his native county, to which he was chosen in December, 1774. The first Continental Congress had already published to the world its indignant protests and earnest appeals. Resistance had been decided upon unless the grievances should be redressed, and the active drama of the Revolution was about to open its eventful scenes.

In May, 1776, the Convention of Virginia for organizing a new government for the Colony, assembled at Williamsburgh. In this Assembly Mr. Madison took his seat as a delegate from the County of Orange. He was then at the age of twenty-five, and, says Mr. Rives, "probably with one or two exceptions, the youngest member of that body." His warm interest in the struggles of the time had prompted him to aspire to a military commission, but the feebleness of his constitution was deemed an insuperable objection to the gratification of his wishes. The earliest proceedings of the Convention, however, were such as could not fail to awaken his profound interest, and call into exercise all his varied powers and acquirements. The members, sitting in "Committee of the Whole on the State of the Colony," at the close of the first week from their organization, reported to the Convention a series of resolutions, setting forth the grievances then suffered by the people, and instructing the delegates of Virginia in the Continental Congress, "to propose to that body to declare the United Colonies free and independent States." These resolutions, which had been fully discussed in committee, were finally reported to the Convention on the 15th of May, and, on the same day, after being twice read, they were unanimously adopted. They are claimed by Mr. Rives as the

earliest positive instructions for independence that were sent to the members of the Continental Congress by either of the Colonies, and it was undoubtedly in obedience to them that the Declaration was, a few weeks afterwards, moved in that body by Richard Henry Lee, in behalf of the delegates from Virginia.

In this great proceeding, Mr. Madison had taken no other part than such as became his youth and inexperience in the presence of the "Conscript Fathers of the Colony." But the same day on which the instructions to the delegates were adopted by the Convention, also witnessed the appointment of a committee for framing a Constitution for the future independent State. Of this committee Mr. Madison was appointed a member, and immediately became engaged in all its deliberations. The first duty of this committee was to prepare a "Declaration of Rights," which should set forth the ends to be secured by the government, and serve as the basis for the new Constitution. This instrument, which is still the Bill of Rights in Virginia, was prepared by George Mason—perhaps the leading mind of the Convention—and by him reported to the body. It was received by the members with very high appreciation, and was adopted without change, save by a single amendment, which was proposed by Mr. Madison, and had its origin in his clear apprehension and true estimation of religious freedom. The article in the Declaration relating to this greatest of Rights, as it came from the hands of Colonel Mason, contained a provision that "all men should enjoy the fullest *toleration* in the exercise of religion," &c. But Mr. Madison had meditated too profoundly on the principle involved, and its application to Virginia, to be satisfied with the word "toleration." He instantly perceived its latent and dangerous inadequacy, as an expression of the inalienable right of the human soul to freedom in religious faith and worship, and, overcoming his modest reluctance to present himself before the House, he offered another draft of the article, and made his first speech in advocating its adoption. The article, as amended, contained the declaration "that all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to

the dictates of conscience,"—and thus it was finally adopted by the Convention. The difference between these two forms is now conceded to be of vital importance, though the distinction, even in our own time, has been often overlooked. But to Mr. Madison's well-instructed judgment, toleration was a mere legal permission instead of an unchartered right, and he clearly apprehended the perversions that might be made of it by the selfish interests of the dominant Church of his native State.

In October, 1776, the Convention of delegates which had framed the new Constitution, became, by the provisions of that instrument, the Lower House of Assembly, and Mr. Madison remained at his post as a member of this first republican legislature. Scarcely had the session begun, when the House was flooded with petitions for the more perfect establishment of religious freedom. These petitions, though differing widely in detail, yet agreed in the general prayer for the abolition of the existing church establishment, and the repeal of the laws which gave preference or advantage to any particular church or Christian denomination. Some of them asserted in its length and breadth the voluntary principle of supporting religion, while others contended only for the right of designating the faith and worship to whose maintenance their taxes should be appropriated. They were signed very numerous by all classes of the community—excepting alone the Episcopalians and Methodists—both of whom withheld their signature—the former because all their ecclesiastical interests were involved in the established polity; the latter because the Wesleyan connection to which they belonged were not yet sufficiently separate from the Anglican Church to be arrayed against its temporal interests. There were, however, very many in both these communions who fully approved the principles which the petitioners desired to establish.

Among these petitioners the most active and the most numerous were undoubtedly the Presbyterians and the Baptists. The former argued their petitions on various grounds, and indeed sought for different degrees of religious freedom; while the latter were undeviating and uncompromising in their de-

mands for a total exemption from every kind of legal restraint or interference in matters of religion. For this they were misrepresented and maligned, and treated with every sort of indignity and persecution. But they kept their faith, and at length witnessed the triumph of the great principle of which they had always been, alike in evil report and in good report, the dauntless, consistent, and it is not too much to add, the solitary asserters. In a letter written in 1768, the Deputy Governor, John Blair, who had made inquiry respecting their worship, reported of them that "they administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper near the manner we do, and differ in nothing from our Church but in that of baptism, and their renewing the ancient discipline, by which they have reformed some sinners and brought them to be truly penitent; nay, if a man of theirs is idle and neglects to labor and provide for his family as he ought, he incurs their censures, which have had good effects. If this be their behavior, it were to be wished we had some of it among us."

Under these auspices, the question was urged upon the attention of the legislature of Virginia, at its first session under the new constitution, and it was contested with an energy and zeal seldom surpassed. Mr. Jefferson took the lead in behalf of the petitioners, and was promptly supported by Mr. Madison, Colonel Mason, and other influential members. But the tone of the House was at the outset strongly adverse to the petitioners, and it was only after a struggle, renewed from day to day for nearly two months, that a bill was finally passed repealing all penal enactments which restrained freedom of religious opinion or worship; excepting all dissenters from taxes for the support of the Established Church, and suspending for the present all legal provision for the salaries of ministers. Another provision of the same bill also reserved for future determination the whole question of providing for the support of the clergy of the various Christian bodies. Immediate relief was thus secured, though the principle contended for was not fully established.

Mr. Madison continued to hold his seat in the House of Delegates till the general election in April, 1777, when he

honorably failed of a reëlection, for no other reason than his open refusal to furnish an *Election Treat*, at that time made essential to success, by a custom nearly universal in Virginia. This result was the occasion of no little mortification to many of his constituents and others of his fellow citizens, and it was even made the subject of a remonstrance against the title of the person elected to his seat in the House. Mr. Madison, however, was immediately appointed by the legislature to the Council of State, and in that position maintained an intimate connection with most of the great movements of the time. He also found frequent occasion for the use of his varied acquirements in History and Philosophy, and especially for the exercise of his rare mastery of language, in shaping the executive documents and influencing the proceedings of the executive council.

On the 14th of December, 1779, he was chosen by the legislature one of the delegates from Virginia to the Continental Congress, and took his seat in that body in March, 1780. He was twenty-eight years of age when he was thus transferred from the council of a Province to the confederate legislature of the Continent. The period was one of the gloomiest and most discouraging in the history of the revolution. The enthusiasm inspired by early success had wholly subsided. The army, enfeebled and depressed by its disasters, was on the verge of dissolution. The States had become distrustful of each other, and either withheld their quotas of supplies, or granted them only with the utmost reluctance. Congress, though not destitute of political influence, was yet without chartered authority or recognized prerogatives. The articles of confederation had been for two years before the States, but they had not yet acquired the validity of universal adoption. The national currency was depreciated, and the national credit was ruined. The French alliance, it is true, had been consummated, but the country had thus far failed to experience the benefits it had promised, and men's hearts were everywhere failing them for fear. The Army, the States and the Confederacy alike seemed to be sinking into demoralization and despair. Washington alone stood erect, undismayed "in

heart or hope" amid the general ruin. In him the genius of the revolution was embodied, and to his calm strength, his heroic firmness, his transcendent excellence, far more than to any agency of government, any wisdom of statesmen, or any patriotism of people, is its ultimate success to be ascribed.

Such was the scene which the country presented when Mr. Madison entered the National Congress. He found there comparatively few of the great men who had formerly mingled in its councils; but though he was too modest and inexperienced immediately to assume any leading part, he yet comprehended at a glance the whole state of public affairs, and found its true explanation in the unsoundness of the financial system, and in the utter inadequacy of the government to the emergencies which it was called to meet. These were evils which no statesman of the revolution might hope entirely to remedy; the utmost that could be attempted was to alleviate them and make them less intolerable, till some foreign loan or some signal achievement should reanimate the national heart, and stimulate it to one more paroxysm of energy—one more effort of contribution and sacrifice. This was the endeavor of Mr. Madison. He, like the illustrious chief of the army, believed that triumph was already certain, if patriotism and endurance did not fail. He therefore favored every measure that tended to sustain the commander-in-chief, to secure supplies for the army, to promote united action and counsel among the States, and to increase the efficiency of the national government. The summer of 1780 was enlivened with new encouragements that brightened the prospects of the revolution. The fleets of France arrived upon the coast, and brought with them the promised troops of the King, and also the assurance that others were soon to embark. New hopes were at the same time inspired of loans from Holland and from France, and of an alliance with Spain.

Around this latter subject there soon arose a question of great difficulty and importance, in which Mr. Madison became warmly enlisted. The condition on which Spain offered her alliance to the struggling colonies, was their relinquishment of all their claims to the navigation of the mouth of the Mississippi—a

concession which would have not only repressed the growth of the Western States, but would have sown the seeds of domestic contention and a foreign war. So great, however, were the necessities of the country, that many members of Congress were willing to accept the condition imposed by Spain, rather than forego the anticipated benefits of her coöperation. But Mr. Madison was very decidedly opposed to the concession, and was appointed a member of the committee that was to prepare instructions for Dr. Franklin and Mr. Jay, who were charged with the negotiation. His views appear to have prevailed with his associates, and to him was assigned the task of writing the instructions. This document was distinguished for its marked ability and its statesmanlike views of national policy, and it immediately secured for its author a commanding position in the body of which he was probably the youngest member. The instructions were adopted as they were reported, and were transmitted to the negotiators. They proved unacceptable to Spain, and though they were subsequently modified by Congress, in a moment of timid apprehension, the alliance was never consummated, and the right of navigating our noblest river to its mouth was fortunately never abandoned by the country.

Mr. Madison sat in the revolutionary Congress from March, 1780, to December, 1783, nearly a year longer than had been before allowed by the law of Virginia. But so highly were his services appreciated by his native State, that her law prohibiting the election of a delegate for more than three consecutive terms within six years, was repealed by the legislature for the special purpose of allowing his return for the fourth time. The period embraced in this portion of his public career was crowded with national perils and disasters, as well as with brilliant deeds and triumphant results. It began with the gloomiest moment of the mighty struggle, and did not close till independence had been acknowledged, till peace had been ratified by treaty with Great Britain, and a new republic had been added to the nations of the earth. The public questions, too, with which this period was filled, were of the utmost interest and importance, and related in many instances to the foun-

dations of social order and public security. They were precisely the questions which in all ages offer the surest tests of wise and genuine statesmanship—questions of the necessary powers of government, of the basis of the financial system, of the management and support of armies—questions of peace and of war, and of foreign alliance and diplomacy. The old Congress, it should be remembered, concentrated in its single body all the functions of the national government. It was in itself the only executive, as well as the only legislative authority, and was also the source of all the judicial power known to the confederation. The few leading minds who wielded that solitary and small assembly, were obliged to consider and decide public questions of every kind, such as in our day are distributed among the numerous officers of the three great departments of the government. The American statesman of that age could turn back to no precedents of the past for his guidance. He was compelled to solve the problems of government for himself, with no assistance from the experience of others.

It is only from a point of view like this, that we can fully appreciate the statesmen of the revolutionary age. They are to be looked at and estimated singly and in the light of the principles they severally expounded and the measures they advocated or opposed. The Old Congress, as a whole, was a signal failure. It was called to a work which it did not, and could not perform. It organized the revolution and gave it the sanction of a national name and character, but independently of this, the revolution went on to its final triumph rather in spite of the blunders and inefficiency of the Continental Congress, than by any assistance derived from its measures. Its constitution was radically defective,—its powers were wholly inadequate, the functions assigned to it were impracticable for a deliberative assembly. It presented in consequence only the shadow of a government.

The career of Mr. Madison in this earliest American Senate, is one which will endure the most searching scrutiny of the maturer experience of a later age. The principles which governed him were liberal and elevated, and the measures which he advocated, were such as, with scarcely a single ex-

ception, would now be pronounced wise and statesmanlike. Next to independence, or rather as a part of independence itself, the great ends he aimed to secure, were a comprehensive nationality among the States, and a scrupulous fidelity to every engagement, both at home and abroad. These great ideas were paramount in every question he was called to decide, and they animated him in all the labors which he performed. In accordance with their suggestions, he used his utmost exertions in removing the hindrances to the adoption of the confederation—in securing more effectively from the States their apportionments of supplies for the prosecution of the war—in resisting all overtures of a dishonorable peace—in inspiring among the States a generous confidence in the French alliance—in fostering the continental army and promoting the views of its great commander—and at last when the war was ended, in advocating the broadest grounds of national independence and of reciprocal obligation and equality, as the only basis of the treaty with Great Britain.

We might readily illustrate his services in the Continental Congress, by referring at length to the views which he expressed and the exertions which he made on each of the great interests of the country which we have named above, and on others connected with them. They would show how superior he was to the local interests and State jealousies then so widely prevalent in Congress, and how largely he breathed the spirit of that coming time when a new and fairer form of government should arise to take the place of the feeble and distracted confederation, to enshrine in itself the spirit of American nationality, and lead on the republic in the pathway of freedom and of power. Indeed even within the period which his biographer has embraced in the present volume, we find him, in conjunction with General Washington, then a private citizen of Virginia, engaged in promoting those great enterprizes of internal communication between the States which led to the two conventions at Annapolis, to the greater convention at Philadelphia, and to the Constitution of the United States. These movements, in which he was intimately associated with the illustrious father of the republic, were but the legitimate de-

velopment of the broad and comprehensive views which he had been forming and cherishing amid the philosophic studies of his youth, and amid all the patriotic services of his manhood, alike in his native State and in the Congress of the revolution.

But we prefer to turn from these portions of his early career, whose records are already a part of the history of the country, to the less conspicuous, though, as we believe, not less important services which he rendered in the establishment of religious freedom in Virginia — the same cause whose struggles, as we have already seen, had enlisted the best energies and the noblest sentiments of his opening manhood. The clear declaration which he had caused to be incorporated in the Virginia Bill of Rights, had been applied to the subsequent legislation of the State. The ancient ecclesiastical establishment had been abolished, and nonconformity had ceased to be a crime. Public opinion also had undergone a very important change, even among those who were members of the Church of England, as it was still called. But the full idea of religious liberty had not yet taken possession of the public mind. The Episcopal parishes still retained possession of the glebe lands and other property which had been appropriated for the common support of religion, and this gave them an advantage possessed by the members of no other church. The suspension of the assessment for the maintenance of the clergy, which was first decreed by the legislature in 1776, had been renewed year after year, though a legal provision for this purpose was still a favorite measure with a large and influential portion of the people.

The sentiment of religion, as well as all its outward institutions, had greatly declined during the war of the revolution, and churches of every denomination were sadly reduced, both in numbers and in Christian efficiency. In addition to this diminished power of the Christian church, society, not only in Virginia, but in every other State, had been exceedingly demoralized amid the vindictive passions and sanguinary scenes through which the country had been struggling on to independence. Indifference to religion was the characteristic of the time, while a scornful scepticism was widely prevailing, especially

among intellectual men and the rising youth of the educated classes. These melancholy results, though by no means confined to Virginia, were yet perhaps more conspicuous there than in any other State, and in no Christian denomination of that State were they so deeply felt as in the Episcopal Church. The distinguished historian* of Episcopacy in Virginia informs us that a large number of the church edifices were either destroyed or irreparably injured; that twenty-three out of the ninety-five parishes became extinct, and of the remaining seventy-two, thirty-four were destitute of all ministerial services. Of ninety-one clergymen who were there at the beginning of the war, only twenty-eight remained, and of these nearly half had been obliged to suspend their ministry during its continuance. Many had adhered to the Crown and returned to England, or been driven away in the turbulence of the times; and though the greater part of the Episcopal laity had espoused the cause of independence, there were yet more of them than of any other Christian communion who withheld from it both their allegiance and their coöperation.

In these circumstances it was natural that the members of the Episcopal Church should now, at the close of the war, turn to the legislature for the pecuniary aid they so much needed in rebuilding their dilapidated places of worship, and reanimating their nearly extinguished faith. Accordingly in 1784 they sent up various petitions to the houses of assembly, praying for the incorporation of the Episcopal Church, for securing to it the glebe lands and other property formerly belonging to their ecclesiastical establishment, and also either for a tax for its particular benefit, or for a general assessment for the

* Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States. By Francis L. Hawks. Vol. 1: p. 153. We are surprised to find the respected author of this work writing of the Virginia Baptists of that age that "they revenged themselves for their sufferings by the almost total ruin of the Church." —P. 138. The author appears to make no distinction between "the Church" and the establishment. The sole aim and the sole work of the Baptists was to abolish the connection between Church and State. Did Dr. Hawks mean to assert that this is the same thing as "the almost total ruin of the Church"? Or, would he teach that "the Church" in Virginia could not exist save when supported by public funds and enforced by law upon the faith of the people?

payment of the clergy and the support of public worship. In this latter branch of their petition they were also joined by "the United Clergy of the Presbyterian Church," who, with many of their laity, were willing to favor a compulsory support of religion, though they were opposed to the legal establishment of any particular church. To all these objects, however, the Baptists, from their very principles as a society, were unalterably opposed; but the struggle at length centred mainly around the question of "the General Assessment." They alone—both ministers and people—uniformly remonstrated against every form of legislative interference, and in their petitions prayed "that no step might be taken in aid of religion, but that it might be left to its own superior and successful influence."

In the legislatures of 1784 and 1785, to which these petitions were addressed, Mr. Madison sat as a Delegate of the lower house for his native county. There can be no doubt that the project of an assessment was favored by the most influential portion of his constituents, as well as of his fellow-citizens throughout the State. But he had not changed the principles or abated the sentiments which he had avowed and acted upon ten years before. He was a leading and rising member of the house, and was warmly interested in many of the questions that were before it, but no complications of party politics, and no lures of personal ambition, could tempt him to abandon for a moment the cause of religious freedom. The principle of no legislative interference, either for the regulation or the support of religion, which was asserted in the petitions of the Baptists, was also his own principle, and he was earnest and eloquent, and at length triumphant in maintaining it. Many who had acted with him in the separation of the Church from the State, were now willing that all churches alike should secure the aid of a general assessment appointed by law. The petitions of both parties were referred by the House of Delegates to the "Committee on Religion"—which had always been among the standing committees of the body. Their report favored the project of an assessment; its principle received the approval of the House, and a bill for the

purpose was soon introduced by a committee, of which Patrick Henry was chairman.

In addition to Mr. Henry, who was the leading champion of the measure, it was advocated by Mr. Marshall, afterwards Chief Justice, by Mr. Tazewell, Mr. Jones, and others of Mr. Madison's friends in the House, and it also had, at the outset, the influential approval of Richard Henry Lee, and even of General Washington. They recognized in it only an equitable provision for public morals and the common good, and deemed it no infraction of any principle of religious freedom. Mr. Madison, however, regarded it in a very different light, and in the debate which ensued came forward as the leader of the opposition, in which he was powerfully supported by Colonel Mason and Mr. George Nicholas. The speech which he delivered has not been preserved, but Mr. Rives gives us, in a note, the heads of the argument, which he finds among his papers. This general outline of his remarks not only illustrates the carefulness with which he prepared himself for this great debate, but it also shows that his opposition to the bill had its origin not less in his sincere and sedulous care for Christianity, than in his zeal for freedom in matters of religion. It was because he understood the true nature of Christianity, and appreciated the perennial power of its Heavenly truths, that he resisted, to the utmost, every interference of the civil State for its regulation or support. He maintained that an assessment for the benefit of Christianity would necessarily involve a determination of what Christianity really is, and would thus unavoidably bring it again to the jurisdiction of courts and legislatures, and at length of magistrates and sheriffs, as it had been in the evil days of the Colonial Church. He also asserted that in its holy mission for the salvation of men, it needed no such aid, and could only be injured and degraded by receiving it. In a word, the great idea which he put forth was identical with that which had always been devoutly cherished by our Baptist fathers, alike in the old world and the new, and which precisely a century and a half before, had been perfectly expressed in the celebrated Letter of Roger Williams to the people of his own settlement, and by him

incorporated into the fundamental law of the Colony of Rhode Island. By Mr. Madison it was elaborated with arguments and wrought into the generalizations of statesmanship; but the essential idea is precisely the same with the "soul liberty" so earnestly contended for by the Baptists of every age.

The bill for the "General Assessment" was reported to the House on the 22d of December, 1784—its principles having already been approved by a decisive vote nearly a month before. It was warmly debated for two days, when its third reading, after the utmost exertion, was postponed, by the vote of a small majority, to the next session of the legislature, which was not to be held till October of the following year. Immediately after this vote, an order was adopted that twenty-four copies of the bill be distributed in each county, and that the people be requested to make known to the next legislature their wishes respecting the General Assessment. The session then came to a close on January 5th, 1785—the great question of the day having been referred to the decision of public opinion, at whose ultimate bar it was to be argued, and decided by the elections of the coming spring.

Gratified at this important result, and believing a complete triumph to be now within their reach, the opponents of the assessment were determined to remit none of their exertions. They consulted together as to the best mode of enlightening the public mind respecting the issues at stake, and agreed that a "Memorial and Remonstrance" should be prepared and circulated through the State. The preparation of this paper was, by common consent, assigned to Mr. Madison, and nobly did he execute the work. "In this masterly paper," says Mr. Rives, "he discussed the question of an establishment of religion by law, from every possible point of view—of natural right, the inherent limitations of the civil power, the interests of religion itself, the genius and precepts of Christianity, the warning lessons of history, the dictates of a wise and sober policy—and treated them all with a consummate power of reasoning, and a force of appeal to the understandings and hearts of the people, that bore down every opposing prejudice and precluded reply. It was diffused extensively through the

State, and was rapidly covered with the signatures of the voters." When the legislature again assembled in the following October, the table of the House was loaded with copies of the memorial, bearing a multitude of names from the constituency of every county. In some instances the delegates came instructed to vote against the assessment; in others, the election had turned upon the question, and those who had advocated the bill were no longer members of the House. The measure, it was obvious, was already doomed, and when the vote was taken it was abandoned by its surviving friends without a struggle. At the same session, and as a result of this awakened public sentiment, the legislature also adopted the celebrated "Act for the Establishment of Religious Freedom," which had been framed by Mr. Jefferson, and reported by the Committee on the Revision of the Laws so long ago as 1779.

The passage of this Act, which followed almost immediately the defeat of the Assessment Bill, is the latest event belonging to the period of Mr. Madison's life embraced in the volume now before us. It was a guarantee of religious freedom, in its amplest form, to all the people of Virginia, and in its ultimate results it led, a few years later, to the repeal of the law allowing religious incorporations, and finally to the assumption of the "glebe lands" as the property of the State. These lands, since the abolition of the establishment, had remained in the hands of the Episcopal Church, and had, as was deemed unfairly, lightened the burdens of its support; but in 1802 the legislature declared that they were originally bestowed for the common benefit, and ordered them to be sold, under proper restrictions, by the Overseer of the Poor.* By this proceed-

* Of this Act, which, whether wise or unwise, only reduced the Episcopal Church to the level of all others, Dr. Hawks, in his history, has thought proper to record that "the warfare begun by the Baptists seven-and-twenty years before, was now finished; the Church was in ruins, and the triumph of her enemies was complete." The account which he gives shows full well that "the Church, was in ruins," but the record justifies no other conclusion than that "the Church" in that age was far more dependent on the provisions of law than on the piety of her members. It simply shows that "her enemies," as Doctor Hawks styles them, only stripped her of her worldly reliances, and taught her to develop her true spiritual strength.

ing, though long severely contested, was at length destroyed every trace that remained of anything like legal advantage of one Christian denomination over the others.

The opposition which Mr. Jefferson early made to the established Church in Virginia, and his authorship of the "Act for the Establishment of Religious Freedom," have gained for him a marked celebrity as a champion of the cause. His exertions and his votes on the question undoubtedly enlisted in his behalf as a public man and a party leader, the warm sympathies of many of the Baptists and other friends of religious freedom throughout the country. One of the volumes of his published works is largely made up of replies which he returned to addresses of congratulation that came to him from religious and other public bodies. Among these appear to have been many from Baptist associations—nearly all of which make mention of his services in behalf of freedom in matters of religion. It is, however, well known that many even of those who approved his labors, yet withheld from him their political sympathy, and regarded his motives with distrust and suspicion. He had no faith in Christian revelation, and in his hostility to an established church he, of course, laid himself open to the imputation of desiring only to diminish the power of Christianity over the minds of men. The celebrated act for establishing religious freedom, of which he was the author, has also often been condemned by Christian writers—not so much for the principle it asserts, as for the needlessly irreverent tone which is said to pervade it. This criticism may have been pressed too far; but it must be remembered that he who is a foe to religion can be no true and trusty friend of religious freedom. We are not, therefore, to wonder that Christian men should regard with suspicion and aversion the statesman who so often publicly avowed his hostility to the Christian religion—who chose his friends from among its foes, and who carefully excluded it from the University which he founded and long continued to control. The words of the ancient Trojan express the natural sentiments, even of good men, when their enemies proffer them benefits—"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

But no such suspicion can attach to the labors of Mr. Madison, nor can any such objection be made to the spirit that pervades the "Memorial and Remonstrance," which he addressed to the people of Virginia, against the whole principle of ecclesiastical establishments. He humbly accepted the faith which Mr. Jefferson rejected, and in laboring for the promotion of individual freedom in matters of religion, he was actuated not more by a regard for the rights of men, than by a sincere desire to rescue Christianity itself from an entangling and debasing alliance with politics. The freedom which he advocates is not licentiousness, nor does he advocate it that it may offer a better soil and a more congenial atmosphere for the growth of infidelity, but because in this freedom man finds his inalienable right, and Christianity its true and native element. His noble defence of this freedom in the hour of its perilous crisis in Virginia, is a monument alike of his character and his genius—of his faith and his intellect—to which Christian history takes no exception—rather on which she pronounces her warm eulogium. It is certainly one of the fullest and best arguments ever penned upon the subject, and of itself goes far to justify the high estimate which Mr. Rives records of his services, when, at the conclusion of the volume, he declares that "to him, of all the men of his age, posterity will award the meed of preëminence for long, earnest, persevering and efficient exertions in defence of one of the most precious rights of human nature—the basis of every other and the indispensable guarantee of civil and political liberty."

ARTICLE III.—INDIA.

PART SECOND—BRITISH INDIA.*

-
- 1.—*Rise and Progress of the British Power in India.* By PETER AUBER, M. R. A. S. In two Volumes. London.
 - 2.—*The Administration of the East India Company: a History of Indian Progress.* By JOHN WILLIAM KAYE. London: 1853.
 - 3.—*India, Ancient and Modern.* By DAVID O. ALLEN, D. D., Missionary of the American Board for twenty-five years in India: Member of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and Corresponding Member of the American Oriental Society. Boston: 1856.
 - 4.—*The Three Presidencies of India.* By JOHN CAPPER, F. R. A. S. London: 1853.
 - 5.—*History of the Colonies of the British Empire, from the Official Records of the Colonial Office.* By ROBERT MONTGOMERY MARTIN, Esq. London: 1853.

Oriental travellers tell us that one of the commonest feats of the Indian fakir is to plant, in presence of his wondering spectators, a little seed, which, in the course of a few minutes, germinates, thrusts itself through the soil, grows into large and distinct branches, leaves, blooms, fills the air with fragrance, and gives a shady covert to birds of varied size and hue. Nothing could be a fitter emblem of the origin, growth, and present condition of the British power in the East. Never did the Roman Eagles in their victorious flights over the imperial provinces, wing their triumphant way so fast as the British Lion has bounded in his conquering career over the

* It is due to the author of this article to say, that in the printing of Part First — Ancient India,—in the July number, 1859, there occur a variety of the most vexatious blunders and typographical errors, owing to the incompetency of the proof-reader in New-York, in whom our printers had assured us we could safely place confidence.—*Ed. Chris. Rev.*

woody ghauts and odorous savannas of the Indian Peninsula. It is one of the most stupendous political anomalies in history, that a company of traders in Leadenhall street, London, has been able, at the distance of half the circumference of the globe, to conquer a territory larger than all the United States east of the Mississippi; and to legislate over a heterogeneous population of Aborigines, Hindus, Mussulmen, Parsees, Jews, and Eursians, which exceeds by an hundred and thirty millions the population of the entire American confederacy.

On the last day of the year 1599, Queen Elizabeth granted to a company of gentlemen, a charter under the title of the "Governor and Company of Merchants of London, trading to the East Indies." Among the subscribers to the stock of this Company were "15 Dukes and Earls, 82 Knights, 5 Privy Councillors, 13 Countesses and Ladies, 26 Doctors of Divinity and Physic, 326 Merchants, 18 Widows and Virgins, and 248 without titles. Their charter conferred on them the right of purchasing lands without limitation, and the monopoly of their trade during fifteen years, with the annexed proviso, that should the monopoly be found to be injurious to the public welfare, it might, on two years' notice, be annulled. Such was the origin of the famous East India Company.

For one hundred and fifty years the Company continued to be nothing more than a mere trading corporation. While the Portugese and Dutch Companies were engaged in ceaseless hostilities on the Malabar coast of India, the English kept quietly building bazaars and chaffering with the natives in the busy streets of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. They had not dreamed of building an empire. Adventurous ambition had not then outstripped timorous avarice. They possessed in their own right only a few acres of land in three or four places, on a sea-coast extending thousands of miles. Even the site on which stood Calcutta, the destined Queen of the East, was hired of the Nabob of Bengal. The only boon which the English asked was that they might be permitted to peddle their wares for indigo, shawls, and pongees in peace.

But the spirited race which for five centuries had been the hereditary foes of Britain, suddenly confronted the English-

man in tropical zones. For some years the French had established themselves in Southern India. They had thrown up and garrisoned a fort at Pondicherry, eighty miles south of Madras. Dupleix, the French Governor, was ambitious, sagacious, unscrupulous. He had already conceived the gigantic design of taking advantage of the political distractions which were then convulsing India, to found on the ruins of the Mogul Dynasty a European Empire, and to unite the fortunes of the House of Tamerlane with the fortunes of the House of Bourbon. To achieve this magnificent project, he tasked every faculty of an intellect extraordinarily inventive. He spared neither bribe nor falsehood. He coaxed and he menaced. He intrigued with the native Powers. He arrayed one native Power against another. Success attended his policy. District after District was added to the French territory. At length he succeeded in deposing the Viceroy of an immense region called the Karnatic, and substituted in his place a puppet whom he could easily manage. Elated by his success both in India and in France, where he had succeeded in causing his formidable rival, M. de La Bourdonnais, to be thrown into the Bastille, he founded a city, which he pompously named Dupleix Fatihabad—the *City of the Victory of Dupleix*—and raised a stately shaft, on the four sides of which he inscribed in four languages the triumphs of his arms. He was now master of a territory nearly as large as France itself. “No petition was granted by the puppet Nizam, unless it had been signed by Dupleix. No money was current in the Karnatic but that which was coined in the French mint at Pondicherry.” Dupleix now fancied that the prize of India was almost within his grasp.

Yet one circumstance made him feel uneasy. He knew that a company of *Englishmen* resided at Madras. It is true, they were only a trading corporation. But then they were Anglo-Saxons. They inherited the Anglo-Saxon energy, the Anglo-Saxon intellect, the Anglo-Saxon valor. He understood perfectly well that their presence in India would be a fatal impediment between himself and the throne of Aurungzebe. His mind was made up. He resolved to expel every Englishman from Hindustan.

Little did Dupleix then dream that a slender, pale-faced stripling, who had never drawn sword except in mimic combat with his playfellows, would, in less than two years' time, raze to the dust the foundations of the City of the Victory of Dupleix, and expel its founder forever from the Karnatic. Fortunate was it for the East India Company, fortunate was it for Asia, that at this juncture Robert Clive was a book-keeper in Madras.

We cannot stay to rehearse the story of Clive in India. The brilliant pen of Macaulay has portrayed how the young hero met Dupleix in many a field of action, and defeated him; how with 200 Europeans and 300 natives he surprised and took Arcot, the capital of the Karnatic; how with this little garrison of 500, he kept his position in the city for 50 days against a besieging host of 11,000; how he ascended northward, and terribly avenged on the Nabob of Bengal the horrible atrocity of the Black Hole; how he began the foundations of the Anglo-Indian Empire by fortifying Calcutta against the native princes; how he tarnished his own lustre, and the lustre of the British name, by beating the Hindu at his own favorite game of perfidy and cheat; how one hundred and two years ago last June, with six guns and twenty-nine hundred troops, (among whom was the ever-glorious Thirty-ninth Regiment which, lately quartered at Montreal, still wears on its colors, in addition to the Castle and the Key worn at Gibraltar, the yet prouder motto, *Primus in Indis*,) he utterly routed, near the mango groves of Plassey, sixty thousand troops under Surajee Dowlah, and subdued an empire larger and more populous than Great Britain; how for these and similar illustrious services his name was lauded at the firesides of England, and the great son of Chatham in open Parliament proclaimed him "a heaven-born general"; how when avarice and ambition had overcome the prudence and the probity of the corporate officials at Calcutta, and insubordination had pervaded the troops, he nobly retrieved his tarnished honor by winning a moral victory grander than that of Plassey; how in ten years' time he invested a little mud fort on the Hoogly with a sovereignty over 150,000 square miles and 30,000,000

of men ; and how, at the age of forty-nine, at his own house at Berkley-Square, he tragically ended a checkered career of crime and glory by suicide.

Clive was succeeded in the administration of India by Warren Hastings. What Demosthenes did for the King of Macedon, what Cicero did for the Proprætor of Sicily, Edmund Burke has done for this Proconsul of Hindustan. The name of Warren Hastings will ever live, not only in the matchless oratory of Burke, and Pitt, and Fox, and Sheridan, but also in the pages of an essay which, perhaps, is the most brilliant that has ever appeared in English literature. To the general spirit and statements of that celebrated paper we yield our hearty assent. Yet it contains some strange errors of fact, and consequent errors of logic. Take, as an instance, the essayist's vehement arraignment of Sir Elijah Impey, as Hastings's tool in the execution of the famous Brahmin Nuncomar. We do not accuse Lord Macauley of wilfully misrepresenting the facts in this case. Nevertheless, he does misrepresent them. Perhaps, however, it is sufficient apology for the peerless essayist, who, it must be confessed, is no less an expert in the art of libel than in the art of eulogy, to say that certain official documents tending to exculpate Impey were published for the first time in 1846, while the article on Hastings appeared in the *Edinburgh* in 1841. It cannot be denied, however, that the recent papers on the Duke of Marlborough, and the massacre at Glencoe, in *Blackwood's Magazine*, have done terrible execution with the historical veracity of the newly created Peer. The marvel is, that the critic, who had sat in such merciless inquisition over the chronological and biographical inaccuracies of Croker's Boswell's Johnson, should have exposed himself so heedlessly to the tortures of a precisely similar inquisition.

Of the character of Warren Hastings it is extremely difficult to form a just estimate. In him, meanness and magnanimity, moral poltroonery and physical valor, perfidy and integrity, cruelty and gentleness, were so strangely blended, that one is puzzled whether to admire him most as a hero, or detest him most as a monster. When we behold that iron nature

dissolving in the chaste ardor of marital affection; when we see him serenely triumphing over the malignant arts of Sir Philip Francis; and the combined hostility of the Court of Proprietors; when we behold him imprisoned in the sacred city of Benares, with every hope of escape cut off, and exposed to instant death, displaying an intrepidity which reminds us of Julius Caesar, when from his window he calmly looked down on the infuriated mob in Alexandria; when we witness his unruffled and modest demeanor as, arraigned at the bar of the most august tribunal of the age, he calmly fastens his eye on the Jupiter Tonans of the English Forum, while launching against himself the crushing thunderbolts of his hate and scorn, and serenely awaits the verdict of Posterity, we feel as if we were standing in the presence of one of the earth's truest noblemen. But when we see him, without any pretext save the tyrant's plea of State necessity, and in spite of the fundamental law of the Province, sending to the scaffold the sacred person of the Prince of the Brahmin Hierarchy; when we see him ruthlessly invading a peaceful territory, and mercilessly shooting down the wives and children of the chivalric Rohillas; when we see him needlessly insulting and nearly starving to death the aged and revered Princesses of Oude; when we see him shrinking from no intrigue however base, and no atrocity however appalling, we feel like echoing the prayer of Iago's wife, that Heaven would

“——put in every honest hand a whip,
To lash the rascal naked through the world.”

Yet it cannot be denied that Hastings's Administration in India, polluted as it was by perfidy and cruelty, was marked by an extraordinary vigor and sagacity. During his rule of thirteen years, he reduced four large provinces to the British sway, raised the revenue of the Company from \$9,000,000 to \$24,000,000, and established the empire which Clive had bequeathed him, on a more solid and enduring basis.

Hastings's vacation of the office of Governor-General marks a decisive epoch in the History of British India. About this time radical changes were wrought in the organization of the

Government. We cannot select a better point than this around which to cluster the most important peculiarities of the British dominion in India. We are chiefly indebted to Dr. Allen's *Work on India* for the principal materials on this topic.

During the administrations of Fox and Pitt, great complaints were made of the transactions of the Company, and a Parliamentary inquiry into the matter resulted in the creation of a body called the "Board of Control for India." This body is now a department of the British Government. It consists of six members, of whom the first is called President of the Board of Control, but, in fact, he is the Secretary of State for India, and is always one of the British Cabinet. The "Board of Control" appoint the Judges of the Royal Courts in the Three Presidencies of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, the Bishops, and the officers of the Queen's troops serving in India. The "Court of Directors" appoint the Governor-General of India, and the Governors of the Three Presidencies; but these appointments are invalid, without the formal approbation of the Ministry. The office of Governor-General is one of great power, responsibility, and emolument. It is the highest political office under the British Sovereign. The Governor-General's salary is about \$125,000 annually, and his perquisites frequently amount to a larger sum. The perquisites of Lord Dalhousie, in 1850, amounted to nearly \$230,000.

The number of persons employed in the Government is large. They are divided into the "Civil, the Clerical, the Medical, the Military, and the Naval" departments. The "Civil Service" is the first in honor and emolument. The salaries vary from \$5,000 to \$40,000 annually. These do not include perquisites. The "Clerical Service" consists of three Bishops, one hundred and twenty chaplains of the Church of England, and six chaplains of the Church of Scotland. Their salaries vary from \$3,000 to \$7,000. The "Medical Service" consists of about eight hundred regularly educated and legally qualified European physicians and surgeons. Their salaries vary, according to seniority and rank, from \$2,000 to \$10,000.

In each of the Three Presidencies, there is a Supreme Court, called the Queen's Court. The Court of Bengal consists of a Chief Justice, whose salary is \$40,000, and of two Associate Justices, whose salaries are \$30,000 each. In criminal cases, but not in civil, the trial is by jury. The natives are eligible to be grand and petit jurors, and Europeans, Parsees, Mussulmen, and Brahmins, in spite of caste distinctions, are often seen sitting side by side in the jury boxes. The barristers in the District Courts are generally natives. The natives are very fond of litigation, and no where does their moral character appear more unfavorable than in these Courts.* During the discussion of the late renewal of the Company's charter, a vigorous effort was made in Parliament to frame a general Code of Laws for the whole Peninsula. The state of India after the fall of the Mogul Power, was very much like the state of Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. As then in Europe there were the Roman Law, the Lombard Law, the Ripuarian Law, the Bavarian Law, and the Salic Law, so there are now in British India Hindu Law, Mohammedan Law, Parsee Law, and English Law. These systems of jurisprudence are perpetually clashing. As a general rule, the Courts have administered Hindu Law among the Hindus, Mohammedan Law among the Mohammedans, Parsee Law among the Parsees, English Law among the Englishmen. The result is, that what is administered is not certain justice, but capricious equity. What India needs most, next to reform in her system of taxation, is a universal Code of Laws, which shall be uniform in its provisions, and certain in its administration.

* What Lord Macauley says in his paper on Hastings, of the Bengalee, may be said of nearly all the natives: "As usurers, as sharp legal practitioners, no class of human beings can bear a comparison with them. What the horns are to the buffalo, what the paw is to the tiger, what the sting is to the bee, what beauty, according to the old Greek song, is to woman, deceit is to the Bengalee. Large promises, smooth excuses, elaborate tissues of circumstantial falsehood chicanery, perjury, forgery, are the weapons, offensive and defensive, of the people of the Lower Ganges." Lord Macauley's residence of ten years in Bengal, gives his testimony the merit of being that of an eye-witness.

The capital which constitutes the basis of the East India Company, is £7,780,000. The price of this stock for many years previous to the renewal of the charter, in 1853, fluctuated from 250 to 300 per cent. Taking 275 per cent. as the average price, the value of the stock, or capital of the Company, in 1853, exceeded \$80,000,000. This capital is divided into transferable shares. The number of proprietors generally exceeds three thousand. The rate of dividend has been fixed by Parliament at 10½ per cent. The gross revenue of the East India Company for 1850, was \$135,000,000, which also was about the cost of carrying on the government. The debt of the Company was \$251,000,000. But the amount of money in the hands of their numerous agents, and the value of their ships, forts, munitions of war, public buildings, &c., was equal to the aggregate of their debts—that is, the property of the Company exceeded \$250,000,000. The revenue of India has been larger than that of any State of Europe, France excepted.

The Army of the East India Company consists of two parts—the European and the Native. The European complement, divided into the Queen's troops and the Company's European troops, is, in time of peace, about 40,000 strong. The Native Army, called the Sepoy Force, is about 270,000 strong. The entire military force under the control of the English in India, on a peace footing, considerably exceeds 300,000.

The salaries of the European officers are liberal. The pay of a Colonel is about \$8,000 annually, and that of an Ensign about \$1,000. When in the field, their pay is larger. They generally obtain commissions at ages varying from 18 to 22, and at 40 or 45 they can retire with a pension of \$2,250 for life.

The pay of the native soldiers is very much less. The wages of a Sepoy in the infantry does not often exceed \$40 a year. If, after forty years' service, he obtains the rank of soubada-major, he receives a little more than a dollar a day. But the highest native officer, even though he have served forty years, is lower in rank than the British ensign, eighteen

years old, still wry with the nausea of his voyage. After a certain length of service, the Sepoys are at liberty to retire, and receive pensions for life. This system of pensions has had a powerful influence in attaching the native army to their English masters. Each Sepoy hopes to live till he can return to his native village, or to some favorite spot, with an income that will support him comfortably.* This immense Sepoy force in India has been raised entirely by voluntary enrollment, without a conscription or forced levy ever having been necessary. The regiments are generally raised and recruited in one part of the Peninsula, and then employed in another, rarely remaining more than three years in one place. This has been admirable policy on the part of the Company, for in this way the Sepoys lose all local attachments, and become directly dependent on the Government. To enlist regiments in Germany and then employ them in Spain, or in Holland and then employ them in Russia, would be like the course which the English have pursued in managing their native army in the East. For the nations of Europe do not differ more from each other in language, religion, and habits, than do the people of the different parts of India. This, in fact, is one of the secrets by which the English have been able to make India conquer herself.

Among the many prodigies which accompany the rise of the Anglo-Indian Empire, none is more marvellous than this

* "I have beheld," says Sir John Malcolm, "with more patriotic pride than has ever been excited in my mind by any other act of British policy in India, a tract of country more than one hundred miles in length, upon the banks of the Ganges, which had been a few years before a complete jungle, abandoned for ages to tigers and robbers, covered with cultivated fields and villages, the latter of which were filled with old soldiers and their families. When we consider the immeasurable quantity of waste lands in the dominions of the Company, it appears extraordinary that this plan has not been adopted in every part of British India upon a more liberal and enlarged scale. The native soldiers of Bengal are almost all cultivators, and a reward of this nature was peculiarly calculated to attract them." Then follows a sentence which the Directors of the Company would have done well to heed: "The accomplishment of this object would add, in an incalculable degree, to the ties which we have upon the fidelity of those by whom our dominions in India is likely to be *preserved, or lost.*"—*Malcolm's British India*, p. 526.

prodigious army of three hundred thousand men. It was in the terrible struggle between the English and the French for ascendancy in Southern India, in the time of Clive, that the French first brought into the field a battalion of native troops, equipped and disciplined in the European style, and commanded by European officers. So brilliant was the success of the experiment, that the English imitated the French example, and commenced the nucleus of a native army, which is now the astonishment of Christendom. "In many of the most essential duties of a soldier," says the historian Alison, "in sobriety during duty, patience under privations, docility in learning, hardihood in undergoing fatigue, steady, enduring valor, and fidelity to their colors under every temptation to swerve from them, the Indian auxiliaries might serve as a model to any service in Europe." The encomium is merited. "At the first siege of Bhurtpore, in 1805, the 12th regiment of native Bengal infantry was associated with the 75th and 76th British infantry. The British were first led to the assault, and gallantly mounted the breach; but they were driven back with dreadful slaughter, and such was the panic inspired by the disaster, that, when they were ordered a second time to advance, the soldiers refused to follow their officers, and leave the trenches. The second battalion of the 12th native regiment were then ordered to advance: they did so, with resolute steps, though well aware of the desperate nature of the service on which they were sent, and cheered, as they passed, the English troops who lay sheltered in the trenches. Such was the heroic valor of their onset that they overcame all opposition, and planted their colors, in sight of the whole army, on the summit of the breach, having sustained a loss of three hundred and sixty men, being half of their total number when they went into action."* Nor is the heroism of the Sepoy troops more remarkable than their general fidelity. An affecting instance of this is given in *Malcolm's Life of Clive*. When the provisions of the garrison at Arcot were very low, and a surrender, in consequence, seemed inevitable, the Sepoys

* Alison's History of Europe, vol. iii, p. 121.

came to Clive, not to complain of their scanty fare, though but a pittance of rice was allowed, but to make to him this heroic proposal: "Your English soldiers," they said, "can eat from our hands, though we cannot from theirs. Let them have every kernel of the rice, and we will content ourselves with drinking the water in which it was boiled." Macauley justly says, that this "devotion of the little band to its Chief, surpassed anything that is related of the tenth legion of Cæsar, or of the Old Guard of Napoleon."

It was with an army composed of such materials as these, that the East India Company reduced India. The military annals of the British dominion in the East, rival, in thrillingness of detail and splendor of achievement, those of any army in any age of the world. Thermopylæ, and Agincourt, and Austerlitz, have their counterparts in Assaye, and Laswarre, and Lucknow. Nor were the native warriors which rushed against the British battalions, ignoble foes. Hyder Ali and Tippoo Sahib were chieftains worthy the spear of Saladin the Eagle-eyed, and the mace of Richard the Lion-hearted. But even heroes like these were forced to yield to the superior genius of a Clive, a Wellington, a Napier, and a Havelock.

We now resume the thread of our very rapid sketch of Anglo-Indian history. Hastings was succeeded, in 1786, by Lord Cornwallis, of Yorktown memory. He was an amiable gentleman, and his administration, with one exception, was beneficent. That exception, however, should be specially noted, since it involved a radical change in the mode of raising the revenue in India. The principal source of revenue from time immemorial had been, and still is, the tax, or rent, on the land. The universal theory is, that the Government is the paramount owner of the soil, while the occupants are viewed simply as tenants. There are three modes in which the land-tax of India has been assessed. They are called the Zemindar system, the Ryot-war system, and the Village system. We will limit ourselves to the consideration of the Zemindar system, as it was that which was specially disturbed by the action of Lord Cornwallis.

When the Company came into possession of the Bengal Provinces, they found that the Nabobs of Bengal, for the purpose of securing their revenue, had divided the country into districts, and appointed a collector over each district. These collectors were called Zemindars, and received a certain per centage—generally one-tenth—on the rent collected. The Zemindars were merely the agents of the Government, and did not own, as Zemindars, one inch of the soil. But Lord Cornwallis, misled by the analogy of European institutions, fancied that the country could be governed best by a landed aristocracy. Accordingly, by an act of absolutism rarely equalled even in India, he suddenly declared the Zemindars and their descendants to be landlords of the soil forever, on condition of their paying annually to the Government a specified sum of taxes or rents, while the cultivators, though the original proprietors of the land, he declared to be merely the *tenants of the Zemindars*. Thus, in provinces containing a population of 30,000,000, the cultivators of the land, who had occupied it as their own for many generations, and whose right to it had never been questioned by the successive conquerors of India, were, by a single stroke of the pen, made the tenants of the Zemindars, who had not had previously the shadow of a right in the soil, either by inheritance, by purchase, or by improvement. This was the famous “Act of Permanent Settlement.” It resulted, as we might have expected, in the most disastrous consequences. It was disastrous to the Zemindars, for they could not be converted, by the mere edict of the Company, from Asiatic habits of improvidence and prodigality to European habits of industry and economy. It was disastrous to the Company, for the Zemindars, many of whom speedily became insolvent, could not furnish the required revenue. It was specially disastrous to the cultivators, for they were not only robbed of their soil, but they were oppressed, and many of them utterly ruined by the cruel exactions of the Zemindars. In a single season there were in one district—that of Budware—thirty thousand suits of Zemindars against Ryots—that is, the peasants or cultivators of the soil. Lord Brougham, in speaking of this Zemindar system, says that it

wrings from the poor Ryot "eighteen shillings out of every twenty." The tax assessed on the English peasant at home is equivalent to the earnings of thirteen days' labor in a year, while the tax directly levied by the Company on the miserable Bengal Ryot amounts to the earnings of fifty-three days. And if we take into account the exactions of the Middlemen, who interpose between the Zemindars and the Ryots, and the enormous usury of the money-lenders—usually 24 per cent.—and the presents systematically extorted from the peasants, it will be seen that the wretched Ryot is taxed to the amount of about eighty-five per cent. of his entire earnings. Yet this infamous system of land taxation is the source from which a very large proportion of the enormous revenue of India has been raised for many years.*

Lord Cornwallis was succeeded in 1793 by Sir John Shore, subsequently Lord Teignmouth. Though possessing many excellent personal traits, he was too timid and inefficient to make his administration a marked one. He continued in office till 1798.

In the person of Teignmouth's successor, Earl of Mornington, subsequently Lord Wellesley, India found its ablest Governor-General, not excepting Robert Clive and Warren Hastings. Sagacious in council, energetic in the field, high-minded everywhere, Richard Colley Wellesley was a model Chief Executive. If fame were always accurately proportioned to genius, the name of Richard the Marquis would be more illustrious than the name of Arthur the Duke. Lord Wellesley's

* A correspondent of the "Friend of India," sometime since expressed a wish to domesticate the art of caricaturing in India. He proposed that the artist should draw, first, the lean and emaciated Ryot, scratching the soil at the tail of a plough, drawn by two half-starved, bare-ribbed bullocks. Upon his back should be mounted the more robust Suputneedah, and upon his shoulders the Duputneedah; he, again, should sustain the well-fed Putneedah; and seated upon his shoulders should be represented, to crown the scene, the big Zemindar that compound of milk, sugar, and clarified butter." We should be disposed to add another figure to the group. We should portray, mounted over all, and swaddled in bandannas, some rubicund representative of the East India Company. The picture would not be complete without the presence of the Great Zemindar of the Zemindars.

administration of India was marked by a comprehensive and liberal policy, and by great vigor. He was almost too inflexible to be always conciliatory, and his idea of a strong government sometimes tempted him to the very verge of tyranny, of which his temporary censorship of the Press is a famous instance. He took the profoundest interest in the cause of Indian education, and in this he was enthusiastically seconded by William Carey. The noblest act of his Indian career, was the foundation at Calcutta of the "College of Fort William," an institution designed for the thorough education of every youth destined for government service. The College was splendidly endowed, and the range of studies very extensive. It embraced Mathematics, History ancient and modern, Natural History, Botany, Chemistry, Astronomy, the Ancient and the English Classics, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Hindustanee, Bengalee, Telooгу, Mahratta, Tamul, and Kanaree, and the History and Antiquities of Hindustan and the Dekkon. It also included the study of Ethics and Jurisprudence, the Law of Nations and of England. Of this College Dr. Claudius Buchanan was Vice-Provost, and Dr. William Carey a Professor. It is impossible to say how beneficent a revolution in India this institution would have achieved, had it been sustained in Leadenhall street. But the Directors, too shortsighted to discern the immense advantages of such an institution, and, moreover, nettled by the lofty independence which marked the conduct of Wellesley, withdrew their patronage, and substituted in its place the College at Haileybury, England. But though Wellesley failed in his favorite scheme, yet he succeeded in securing the official recognition of the principle on which he founded his scheme—that of "establishing the British empire in India on the solid foundations of ability, integrity, virtue and religion."

The bold and enlightened policy of Wellesley soon filled the timorous Directors with distrust, and they at length succeeded in irritating him into a resignation of the position which he had filled seven years with consummate ability. On his departure the Serampre missionaries addressed him in a letter of enthusiastic eulogy. No statesman has left a

nobler impression on British India than Marquis Wellesley. The only pen which may fittingly portray his career in India, is that which has penned the peerless portraiture of Clive and Hastings.

We cannot dismiss Wellesley without adverting to a signal achievement of his army which entitles him to the gratitude of Protestant Christendom. It was during his brilliant administration that the French succeeded in inducing many of the native Princes to forget for a while their mutual animosities, and to organize a vast confederacy for the purpose of expelling the English from the Peninsula. This gigantic league was headed by the renowned Tippoo Sultaun, the most formidable warrior that ever contested with England for the dominion of India. These allied powers brought into the field more than three hundred thousand troops. But a greater than Tippoo Sultaun was the animating soul of this tremendous confederacy. There can be little doubt, if any reliance is to be placed on the chronicles of Longwood, that for many years Napoleon cherished the design of following in the steps of Alexander and of Tamerlane, and having penetrated the Orient beyond the Ganges, of founding an empire which should stretch from the Libyan Desert to the Kamtschatkan Gulf. When, in 1799, Seringapatam, the capital of Tippoo Sahib, fell into the hands of the British, Colonel Wellesley (subsequently Duke of Wellington,) discovered in the palace certain papers which conclusively indicated that a secret understanding subsisted between the Sultan of India, the King of Afghanistan, the Shah of Persia, the Emperor of Russia, and the French Directory. According to these papers it was agreed that if Napoleon should succeed in his Egyptian campaign, he should join his forces with those of Paul of Russia, and that both should make a simultaneous descent upon India. But the diplomacy of Richard Wellesley foiled the great conqueror in the East, as the military genius of Arthur subsequently foiled him in the West. It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of this achievement of Wellesley. Had Napoleon been successful in this stupendous enterprise, it is not too much to say, that the ambitious prophecy of Dupleix would have swiftly devel-

oped into melancholy history, and the mighty chieftain who died an exiled prisoner on an ocean fastness, would have wielded a triple sceptre over the three great continents of the Eastern Hemisphere. Nor would this have been the worst. The triumph of the French arms would have been followed by the triumph of that political hierarchy whose history, since the day Adrian crowned Charlemagne, proves that she has never been in the ascendant without playing the bigot and the despot. We would not speak unjustly or uncharitably of the Papal Church. We love to believe that there are a few names even in Rome, which, like those in Sardis, have not defiled their garments. The member-roll of the Protestant Church is adorned with no brighter names than those of Augustine, and Pascal, and Fénelon, and Xavier. Yet for all this, we believe that the direst political disaster which can befall any nation, is to have them crushed beneath the iron rule of a prelatical despotism, such as the Church of Rome became in the powerful hands of Hildebrand. We regard, therefore, the downfall of the French power in India as a most notable and auspicious event in the history, not only of that peninsula, but of the whole continent of Asia. For had England been defeated in her struggle with France, we doubt not that Protestantism in the East would have been crushed for ages, while the thunders of the Vatican would now be rolling from Afghanistan to Formosa.

Space does not permit us to trace the history of the British Power in the East, as it rose and fell under the successive Administrations of the pacific Minto, the magnanimous Marquis Hastings, the sagacious Amherst, the beneficent Bentinck, the nervous Auckland, the belligerent Ellenborough, the energetic Hardinge, and the grasping Dalhousie. What Lord Canning, the present Governor-General, will accomplish, or fail in accomplishing; whether or not he will be able to preserve the magnificent Empire which Clive founded in carnage, and Hastings built up with rapine, in the terrible convulsions which have threatened so recently to unsettle its very foundations, is known only to Him who hath decreed the end from the beginning.

Respecting the Great Mutiny of 1857, we have very little to say. We may refer to it in a proposed paper on Christianity in India. Time, that great Umpire in the disputes of History, has not yet pronounced her decision. We will not presume to forestall her judgment. Besides, we have no heart to recall the appalling tales of the sanguinary drama. Respecting the origin of the Mutiny, many opinions have been expressed, but nothing is certainly known. Doubtless there is something of truth in each of the explanations offered, but none of them is completely satisfactory. We are inclined to believe that this insurrection is like one of those moral epidemics which ever and anon desolate a land. Rebellion, though it begin at a single point, is like the pestilence, ever apt to be contagious. But the distemper is in process of rapid and effectual cure. Radical changes are being wrought in the Government of India. The charter of the Company which was to have run to 1874, has been partially revoked. The Administration is gliding more completely under the power of the Crown. Everything is in mutation, but it is the mutation of a new crystallization. For we are disposed to consider these mutinies as constituting only a transient phase in Anglo-Indian History. Unquestionably the present is a momentous crisis. Nothing but unity of councils, inflexibility of purpose, and energy in execution, will save the Anglo-Indian fabric from crumbling even more rapidly than it arose. And we believe that the English race are equal to the crisis. We have too much faith in the superiority of European Civilization over Asiatic barbarism, of Northern energy over tropical effeminacy, of British obstinacy over Indian vacillation, to believe that the English, at least for the present, will permit their Eastern Dominions to glide from beneath their Sceptre.

In conclusion, let us take a rapid survey of the principal features of the British Rule in India.

It was during Clive's Administration that the East India Company first added to their functions as a mercantile corporation the widely different functions of an invading army. The East India Company, as a political power, dates its origin

from the day that the merchants of Madras sent their clerks from the counting-room to the camp. Since that day, trading has too generally been made subordinate to fighting. Expensive as wars always are, it was found that the wars of this Company of traders were exceedingly remunerative, considered as financial operations. A generous sacrifice to Mars was sure to be followed by a generous gift from Pluton. If at any time the Company felt that their revenue was not quite equal to their avarice, and they often felt so, all that it was necessary for them to do, was to make a temporary investment of their funds in ammunition and army supplies, and make the bayonet earn quicker and larger dividends. They have always been sufficiently adroit in preserving a profitable proportion between the howitzer and the treasury. They sent forth first the soldiers to do the mowing, and then the tax-collectors to do the garnering. In this way the Company have not only added India to the British Dominions, but they have forced India to pay for the conquest of herself. "Our wars in India," naïvely remarks Dr. Wilson, and he is a competent authority, "though attended with loss of life, as all wars are, have not cost our Nation a single farthing, but have been defrayed from the revenues or credit of the conquered territories." Dr. Wilson might have added more. He might have added that the Company have made India, in the first place, conquer herself; in the second place, pay the expenses of conquering herself; in the third place, pay no insignificant proportion of the British revenue; and in the fourth place, turn one-half of her own population into paupers for the sake of making a few English aliens millionaires. It seems, then, that the Company have not hesitated to play the freebooter *for a consideration*. When the Marquis Hastings was Governor-General, the Company, seized with a sudden admiration for the nobler virtues, requested him to break up a vast confederacy of mountain robbers, called Pindarees. The gallant Marquis complied with this request, and swiftly dispersed the Pindarees with Anglo-Saxon thoroughness. The act was undoubtedly good and praiseworthy in itself; but the motive becomes somewhat questionable, when we learn

that the Company now enjoy the sole monopoly of the Pindaree trade. The Company have been particularly dexterous in fomenting quarrels between the native powers, and then, when the parties were absorbed in the strife, these pacific traders would innocently slip in and serenely embezzle the revenues of both belligerents. It may seem somewhat surprising that a Company of honorable merchants, born and educated in Christian England, should do these things in the nineteenth century. But then in India, as everywhere else, it is as the poet sings:

“But the jingling of the guinea helps the hurt that Honor feels,
And the nations do but murmur, snarling at each other’s heels.”

It has been charged against the East India Company, that their wars have been uniformly aggressive. In too many cases the charge is just. But we do not think that it holds true of the early wars of the Company. When Clive, in 1751, surprised and took Arcot, it was the French, and not the English, who were the aggressors. Madras was a quiet seaport town, when Dupleix planted his batteries against its unprotected warehouses. And when, at the bidding of Clive, the English merchants exchanged their ledgers for the cartridge box, they marched forth to repel, and not to invade. The aggression was commenced by that ambitious Frenchman, who was then staking his all for the possession of Aurungzebe’s throne. But the English knew very well that their commerce would be destroyed the instant a French Sovereign was crowned at Delhi. It was impossible, from the very nature of things, that a Gallico-Indian Empire and an Anglo-Indian Empire should coëxist. Twenty-one hundred years before, Alexander the Great had declared that the earth could admit of two rulers in the East, no more than the heavens could admit of two suns. It was the fear of Dupleix’s ambition that converted the East India Company from a trading corporation into a politico-military organization. We think that they were amply justified in declaring war against the French; for they were politic enough to see that British security was incompatible with French supremacy. The campaign, as we have seen, resulted

most disastrously to the French. Their prestige with the natives was lost; their power was crushed, and they were ignominiously driven from the Peninsula.

When Clive defeated Dupleix, the French were in alliance with several of the native powers. Hostilities between the English and the French, therefore, inevitably led to hostilities between the English and these Indian chiefs. Moreover, the perpetual conflicts which were waging between the various princes of the Peninsula often left particular territories stripped of any military forces. The English could not resist the temptation of making raids into these unprotected provinces. The state of the country at that time was admirably suited to such robber excursions. For, in the middle of the eighteenth century, all India, from centre to circumference, was in a state of the most violent ferment. That mighty Tartar despotism, whose capital was Delhi, and which for three centuries had been compressing into one Empire one hundred and forty millions of people, widely differing in race, in habits, in languages, and in creeds, was fast dissolving. Released from the gigantic pressure of this despotism, the Indian Empire of the Moguls suddenly burst into a score of mighty fragments. These fragments rapidly took shape, and soon became independent sovereignties. It is true, the House of Tamerlane did not cease, nor has it at any time since ceased to wield a theoretical or phenomenal sway over India. But its power was practically crushed. Though the rulers of the new provinces occasionally sent complimentary presents to the Great Mogul at Delhi, as to their titular sovereign, yet, as a matter of fact, they were absolute monarchs, and disposed of their own revenues, enacted their own laws, and made peace or war, according to their own sovereign pleasure. Historians of British India have been fond of pointing out the many striking analogies between the fall of the Carlovingians in Europe and the fall of the Moguls in Asia. In truth, there is not a finer instance of historic parallels, than that when the Nabobs, and Rajahs, and Nizams of the Indian Provinces bore the same relation to the House of Tamerlane that the Counts, and Margraves,

and Electors of the Germanic States bore to the House of Charlemagne.

But these native princes soon began to turn their arms against each other. Sometimes a prince would be reduced to extremities, and then he would invite the intervention of the English, with which invitation the English never failed to comply. Oftener they would intervene between two hostile parties, without waiting for an invitation from either. Of course this English intervention was only a synonym for the English conquest and permanent occupation of the territory whose destiny had been submitted to their arbitration. And thus the systematic aggressions of the Company have been concealed all along, under the specious title of mediation. These mediatorial services of the bellicose traders have been munificently rewarded; for the jurisdiction of the immense territory between Kandahar and Hong Kong is the result of their disinterested mediation.

Alison, the historian, and the ardent panegyrist of the East India Company, quotes with approbation an observation of Gibbon, that, "in the light of precaution, all conquest must be ineffectual unless it could be universal; for, if successful, it only involves the belligerent power in additional difficulties, and a wider sphere of hostility." Alison then proceeds to defend the wars of the Company, on the ground that they had no alternatives but those of universal dominion, or of universal ruin. The defence, we think, is decidedly Machiavellian. Undoubtedly, it would be good policy for a horde of banditti to shoot down a *posse comitatus*, rather than to be hung. But to demonstrate the morality of the massacre, we think would transcend the capacity, not only of Machiavelli, but of the "Father of Lies" himself.

Perhaps we have dwelt too long on the darker aspects of Anglo-Indian History. If we have, it is because the earlier stages of that history are marked by deeds of peculiar atrocity. And we believe that the Company are reaping to-day the fruits of those atrocious deeds. History demonstrates that national crimes must be followed by national retributions. Macbeth

uttered a truth no less applicable to nations than to individuals, when he spoke of "bloody instructions" returning

"To plague the inventor. This even-handed Justice
Commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice
To our own lips."

We firmly believe in the doctrine of Divine Providence. It is only when we recognize this doctrine, that we can successfully unravel the tangled skein of human History. We do not deem the language of Victor Hugo too bold, when he asserts, in his letter at one of the late anniversaries of the Polish Revolution: "Justice is a theorem. Punishment is exact as Euclid. Crime has its angles of incidence, and of reflection. And we men tremble, when we discern in the obscurity of human destiny the lines and figures of that enormous Geometry, which the crowd call chance, and the thinking man calls Providence." The great Insurrection in India is an appalling illustration of the fact, that moral sequences are as inexorable in national, as they are confessed to be in individual, history.

But it cannot be that the God of Nations has had no beneficent purpose in view, in having permitted the English to overthrow so many Indian dynasties, and to found in their place this new Empire, the startling rapidity of whose erection amazes us, and whose gorgeous magnificence bewilders us. To the mere statesman, the origin, growth, and present condition of the Anglo-Indian Empire, may seem to be only one of those amazing anomalies which ever and anon startle the ages. To him who would recognize the Hand of Deity in human History, they seem to be one of those splendid yet mysterious unfoldings of Jehovah's marvellous schemes, which are working out the redemption of the human race.

Already have the English in India done much to efface the stains on their early history. The celebrated and acrid saying of Burke, when defending the East India Bill of Fox, "Were we driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by anything better than the orang-outang or the tiger," is no longer true. The East India Company have inau-

gured one of the grandest systems of internal improvements ever yet accomplished in any country. The aggregate length of the canals completed in India is 765 miles, the annual revenue of which is nearly \$2,000,000. A gigantic system of railways is beginning to reticulate the entire Peninsula, and the electric wires are beginning to follow its entire contour. The effect of these railways in developing the natural resources of India is incalculable. For her immense grain plantations and her exhaustless coal and iron mines are so far apart that their interchange at present is extremely difficult. But when these channels of transport shall have been opened, India must speedily take a position of the first rank among manufacturing and commercial nations. Better than all this, the English have abolished the inhuman rites of Suttee, and dispersed the dreaded Thugs. They are also bringing a powerful influence to bear on the breaking up caste distinctions. Already some of the Hindus are beginning to feel that it is no more honorable to be born from Brahma's head than it is to be born from Brahma's heels. The chains of caste once broken, a complete revolution, pregnant with the most beneficent results, must at once change the entire social *status* of the Peninsula. A bill has already been introduced into Parliament, which enacts that no native of British India "shall, by reason of his color, his descent, or his religion, be incapable of holding office." The English have done a noble work in insisting that the principle of perfect religious toleration shall be held forever inviolable throughout their Eastern dominions. This single principle of Anglo-Saxon and Protestant Christendom is destined to achieve a stupendous revolution throughout the entire Asiatic continent.

In no respect is it truer that the social condition of India has been vastly elevated, than in respect to the native *women*. The respect paid to woman we regard as one of the most infallible tests of a genuine civilization. For many a mournful century had the Indian matron been buried in the most wretched degradation. Denied the luxuries and even the comforts of life, secluded from the companionship of her sex, bound to him whom she called husband by no tie of affection,

meekly submitting to cold neglect, studied insult, and pitiless abuse, she has been wont to pass the weary days of her miserable life in loneliness, and sorrow, and want. But the English conquerors of India have come to her deliverance. Descendants of the brave old Normans, who, in palmy days of chivalry, tilted in tournament for their lady-loves, they still are proud to avow themselves the champions of woman. And as they behold her in India, a wandering outcast — the trembling victim of a pitiless oppression — they count it unworthy the memory of their brave sires, and unworthy themselves, not to restore to her, with a gallant hand and a grateful heart, the sacred rights and dignities of womanhood.

We have already spoken of the ancient *intellectual* achievements of India. The Hindus are still a singularly intellectual people. Though physically indolent and effeminate, they are eminently contemplative. The Indian Genius has ever loved to seclude herself from the din and bustle of the practical world, and, betaking herself to the realms of the Ideal, commune with the inner mysteries of Being. Thus, more than three thousand years ago, the philosophers of India dreamed out a system of transcendental mysticism, which, afterwards transplanted to the banks of the Nile, has been re-produced in Germany, as though it were an indigenous product of the German mind, and would fain win its way in matter-of-fact America. It has been so for untold centuries. Age after age has rolled away, and yet the Indian intellect has really done nothing for the world, nothing for itself. This phenomenon of an arrested and paralyzed civilization, characteristic not only of India, but of several other Oriental nations, is very remarkable. The Vedas, the Institutes of Manu, the Puranas, the Epics of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, clearly indicate the existence of vigorous mental forces; but these forces have been kept for ages in a state of statical equilibrium. The emasculated Indian Genius, lacking all virile power, has revelled only in the realms of dreamy phantasies, and produced a literature rich only in an acute but aimless philosophy, an exuberant fancy, and a glowing passion.

Now this comatose, phantasmagorial intellect, cannot come into contact with the robust, restless, dynamic intellect of the

Anglo-Saxon race, without being aroused from its dreamy torpor. The introduction of the arts will infuse new vigor into its inventive genius, and the diffusion of science will open new fields for its explorations. Its passive reveries will be exchanged for practical movements. It will become more masculine; its voluptuous fancy will be chastened, and its aims made nobler and more executive.

We have thus given a very meagre outline of the splendid boons which the English have already bestowed on India. We cannot repress our indignation, when we remember the avarice, the perfidy, and the barbarities which attended the establishment of the British power in the East. But when we think of the stagnant, lifeless civilization of the Oriental nations; when we remember that they are no richer in knowledge and virtue to-day than they were on the day that Joshua led the Hebrew host across the Sacred River, we feel like echoing the poet's language, when he sings —

“Better men should perish one by one,

Than that earth should stand at gaze, like Joshua's moon in Ajalon!

Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward, let us range.

Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change.

Through the shadow of the globe we sweep into the Younger Day:

Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Kathay!”

ARTICLE IV.—SPRAGUE'S ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PULPIT.

Annals of the American Baptist Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished Clergymen of the Baptist Denomination in the United States, from the Early Settlement of the Country to the close of the Year Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-Five. With an Historical Introduction. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. New-York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1860. 8vo., pp. 860.

THE preceding volumes of Dr. Sprague's series have been so long before the public that no particular description of them is required. Their great interest and value have commended them to a large body of readers, and secured for them a permanent place in the department of literature to which they belong. We must pass at once from those volumes to the one immediately before us. It is a solid octavo, swelled to the dimensions of eight hundred and sixty pages. It contains, in its principal articles, sketches of the lives and labors of one hundred and seventy ministers of the Baptist denomination, besides incidental notes referring in briefer terms to not less than two hundred more. The biographical sketches are compiled from published memorials, from local and family traditions, and from personal recollections. They are followed, almost universally, by original letters, communicating illustrations of character, and containing incidents and anecdotes, with descriptions of manners and habits, of styles of preaching and methods of evangelical labor. Of letters of this kind the volume comprises nearly two hundred, forming, it may be, one-fourth or one-third of the book.

This naked outline gives, however, but a very inadequate conception of these annals of our ministry. Dr. Sprague has performed this great labor marvellously well, with excellent judgment, with skill, and tact and taste. The names embraced

in it commence with Hanserd Knollys, who preached in this country, a very short time, at its earliest settlement, and come down to honored brethren who departed this life at the close of the year 1855. We miss some names that to us seem well entitled to commemoration in this catalogue of worthies;—there are a few in it, perhaps, which had no special claims to this distinction. All in all, however, the list is selected with discretion, reaching an excellence, in this particular, higher than could have been reasonably anticipated. The biographical sketches, though necessarily brief, are comprehensive and complete. They are not mere registers of facts and dates, but memorials, life-pictures, histories of the persons to whom they relate. It is difficult to express exactly what we feel in relation to this point. It is in this department of the work that the author seems to us noblest and best. He has shown himself to be in “The Communion of Saints.” He has appreciated Christian character and service; he has lived in the lives of those of whom he has written; and brought into unity the great mass of multiform materials which he has used, by the cohesive power of his own Christian sympathies. The two hundred original letters are a striking and most interesting feature. Written by one hundred and thirty-six different writers, embracing, among others, Statesmen and Jurists, Pastors, Presidents and Professors, they all, with four exceptions, relate to persons with whom the writers were personally acquainted, and with whom generally they were in such relations as to make them authentic sources of information. Previously to the Great Awakening, commencing about 1740, the Baptists in this country were all comprised in a handful of churches,—a score, perhaps, in New England, many of them of doubtful orthodoxy,—and a score out of New-England, having their chief centre in Philadelphia, and united under the venerable Confession of 1689. Singularly enough, the letters in this volume, containing personal recollections, reach back to ministers of the period of that Awakening, and so cover the entire period of our marvellous and unparalleled denominational growth. If Dr. Sprague’s labors had been commenced a little later, or if, when commenced, he had not acted upon the motto,

"there is no time like the time present," this would have been impossible. The octogenarian, Joshua Bradley — himself since deceased, and commemorated in this volume — colleague and successor of Gardiner Thurston of Newport, whose ministry was commenced in 1742, furnished a letter concerning that venerable man. The Rev. Benj. H. Pitman contributes likewise, in a letter of much interest, his recollections of Mr. Thurston. Isaac Backus, illustrious among his compeers of the same great period, second to no man in the history of American Baptists, is commemorated in a letter from the Hon. Zechariah Eddy, who was twenty-six years contemporary with him. James Manning, first among those who labored to give to the rapidly growing denomination the advantages of organic unity and intellectual culture, founder and first President of Brown University, has a fitting memorial from his pupil, the late Hon. William Hunter, of Newport. Hezekiah Smith, Jonathan Maxcy, Samuel Stillman, John Gano, Stephen Gano, Thomas Baldwin, William Rogers, Richard Furman, John Leland, Henry Holcomb, William Staughton and John Williams, all belonging to generations now passed away, are commemorated by writers who hold in sacred remembrance their venerable forms and their evangelical labors. A little later, and the beautiful testimony of contemporaries here recorded, would, in respect to several of these characters, have been lost forever.

We observe with pleasure that many of these letters are by others than Baptists. Among other writers of this class we notice the names of the Hon. William Hunter, the Rev. Dr. Laban Clark, the Rev. Dr. William Jenks, the Rev. Daniel Waldo, the Hon. Joseph H. Chandler, the Rev. Dr. Gardiner B. Perry, the Rev. Dr. Edwards A. Park, the Rev. Dr. Nicholas Murray, the Rev. Dr. Alvan Bond, the Hon. James Brooks, the Hon. James McPherson Berrien, the Rev. Dr. Ray Palmer, the Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck, and the Rev. H. M. Field. Some of these gentlemen are Congregationalists, some Presbyterians, some Episcopalians, and one is a Roman Catholic. Some of the letters written by them are affectionate tributes to the memory of a teacher, and others are testimoni-

als of Christian worth and ministerial fidelity, by neighbors and dear friends, who, in the same towns or parishes, labored in the common vineyard of our Lord. Several of these letters, of which we might instance the beautiful letter of the Rev. Dr. Palmer, in commemoration of the Rev. Silas Stearns, and the extended and carefully written memorial of the Rev. Zenas M. Leonard, by the Rev. Dr. Bond, are charming illustrations of Christian fraternity, and in admirable keeping with that general character of the work, of which we have before spoken, impressed upon it, and transfused through it, by the spirit and labors of Dr. Sprague.

In examining this volume we were arrested by the magnitude of the labor required in its preparation. It may not be amiss to spend a few moments in conjecturing the history of such a production. First it is to be conceived in the mind of the author, and though this may be the happy work of genius, a thought flashing on the soul like the inspiration of a poet, it must necessarily, in its inception, be crude and indeterminate. The plan is to be moulded into form, its parts and proportions to be adjusted, and its limits to be defined, in order that the author may proceed intelligently and effectively to his task. Then, that of which his work is to treat is to be found, not so much in books, from which it is so easy to construct a cyclopedia of biography, as in the memories of living men, and in local and family traditions. He is not a Baptist, and the characters to be chosen, and the sources of information to be sought, are to be determined under the immense difficulty of casting himself among comparative strangers for information and advice, and of imposing labors on large numbers of individuals whom he never saw, and on whom he feels that he has not the slightest personal claim. The builder who is to seek stones in quarries, and timbers, planks and boards in forests, and out of the collected materials to rear castle, or palace, or capitol, finds his work already reduced to system and to art, and has an easy task compared with that of the author who undertakes such a production as this. Out of what a quarry, what a forest, are these materials to be gathered, and this temple to be reared! The characters preceding

the middle of the eighteenth century are few in number, easily determined, and disposed of with ample facilities of recorded biography. Then the characters multiply, and come within the memory of living men. They are spread over all the old Colonies and all the present States, and must be so selected from all as most justly to represent the character and history of the denomination. Sectional and personal predilections must be eliminated from the advice which is sought or proffered, and names to be inserted or to be excluded must be determined with care and with reason. How many times, when this work of selection seems to be accomplished, will some new name be brought to the author's knowledge, modifying or changing his plans. How many times will some promising line of inquiry end in utter disappointment, from inability to procure materials. In how many instances will the author's letters seeking information be mislaid, lost, or utterly forgotten. In how many instances will answers be postponed until the delay has already changed the scope of the work, and rendered a readjustment necessary in order that they may be used. How often it will be the case that some omitted point will require new correspondence, and occasion new delay. How will it sometimes occur that even an illustrious name will be in danger of utter omission from this roll of worthies, because by strange conjunctures of family separations, and tardy or neglectful correspondents, oblivion seems to have fallen on forms scarcely cold in their graves. The amount of correspondence required for the preparation of such a volume is appalling.* The grace of patience, and the invincibleness of purpose required for conducting it, merit a monument. And even when all the materials are gathered, what a task is to be performed in the preparation of the biographical sketches, compressing them from extended narratives so as to preserve completeness of information, or forming them anew from crude statements, furnished by unpractised, or, perhaps, incompetent

* We have it on the best authority that the sum paid by Dr. Sprague for postage, in the preparation of the six volumes of his *Annals*, is from \$1,500 to \$2,000.

hands. Even the illustrative letters, which constitute so fresh and charming a feature of the volume, will in many cases require abridgement and editing to prepare them for the public eye. The author's caution must be sleepless, and his labors incessant to the very moment of committing to the printer's hands; and even then his labor is not done, for the wearisome task of proofs and revises will follow him still, giving him no rest until the press commences the multiplication of the matured product.

But in order to appreciate the value of this labor, we must take other views of it than simply to estimate its amount. Let us, then, in the first place, consider it as a contribution to the history of American Baptists. We have already adverted to the fact, that down to the period of the Great Awakening, the Baptists in this country were exceedingly few in number,—that then their great increase commenced,—and that ministers of that period are commemorated in this work by those who were their contemporaries. If then we set aside the anterior portion of American Baptist history, the time of our infancy and feebleness, all whose annals may be gathered within a very brief compass, we have, in the volume before us, that which is by eminence our history, given to us in a series of life pictures, drawn by those who were familiar with the chief actors in the scenes of more than an hundred years. We abate nothing from the literal import of these words. We have here that which, for all that long and grand period, constitutes our history; and we have it so completely, that were all other sources of information sealed up forever, the historian of observing and philosophical spirit, might trace and record its developments from these materials alone. The work being well done, the result could not be otherwise. These biographies are the biographies of active, influential men. Active and influential life implies determinate and recognized relations, and records of such life, therefore, include of necessity records of contemporaneous events. The lives here recorded extend over the whole period referred to; they are of men whose spheres of labor were widely diffused—some in New-England, some in the Middle States, some in the South, and

some in the West, some in Asia and some in Africa ; they are of men in every department of denominational service, pastors, teachers, editors, authors, evangelists, and missionaries. Such biographies, we repeat it, must, if well executed, embrace the history of the period to which they belong. They are the better authority, moreover, for the fact that they proceed from sources so numerous and so diverse. The illustrative letters alone proceed, as we have said, from one hundred and thirty writers. Directly and indirectly the biographical sketches have origins as numerous. What a cloud of witnesses then is here, correcting and corroborating each other ; one supplying the deficiencies of another, and all combined presenting an accumulation of facts from which little, except statistics and local details, is left out. If any one doubts this estimate of the historical value of these materials, let him settle the question by tests. Does he inquire concerning the history of public and professional Education, as an element of our denominational history ? He will find it in the sketches of Manning, of Maxcy, of Chaplin, of Staughton, of Knowles, of Nathaniel Kendrick, and of Maginnis,—not to extend a list which might be increased indefinitely. Does he ask the history of our Foreign Missions ? It is narrated in the lives of Judson, Rice, and Boardman, and of pastors at home such as Bolles, and Bennett, and Mercer. Does he ask concerning the progress of evangelization in the new settlements of our own country ? The time would fail us to tell of the worthies here recorded, whose lives are illustrious for the labors in which they planted the seeds of the gospel wherever the soil was opened by the toils of pioneers. Historical order, the interlinking of causes and consequences, the successive pictures which make history a moving panorama, are indeed wanting here ; but the materials are furnished, and at some time the genius of history, acknowledging her obligations for this vast accumulation of facts, will breathe upon them her spirit, and bring them into orderly narrative, instinct with her own life.

The value of Dr. Sprague's book may be further seen by considering it as illustrating the power of propagandism which belongs to our distinctive denominational principles.

There are a great many people who suppose that we are distinguished chiefly by the quantity of water which we use in baptism ; wholly, indeed, by that and the mere time when the symbolical washing occurs. As to the water, it is only a question of much or little — as to the time only of earlier or later. Understood as embodying no principles, these differences are often accounted as trifles, for the contention of brethren whose weakness is to be pitied. Even at the very time when our principles were working a signal revolution in the ecclesiastical condition of the United States, so good a man as the late Rev. Dr. Belknap, the historian of New-Hampshire, could make these differences the playthings of his wit. The quarrel between John Codline and Roger Carrier, he reduced to the questions, whether the face should be washed by dipping it in the water, or by raising water to it with the hands ; and whether the face should be washed in infancy, or be left unwashed till the child was old enough to wash it himself, without the aid of his parents.* Great revolutions are not effected by trifles such as these. Not what Parliament did, but what Parliament claimed the right to do, snapped the links which bound the Colonies to Great Britain. Taxes on tea, and stamps on paper, were only as the weight of a feather ; but the claim of the right to bind or loose, in regard to these matters, at its pleasure, was a principle in government which was not to be endured for an hour. So principles are always an hundred-fold more powerful than facts. The principles by which the Baptist denomination are distinguished have often illustrated this truth. The Brownists, the original Congregationalists of England, went into exile in Holland, bearing with them the distinctive principle of a spiritual church — of a church composed of spiritual members only — but holding this principle in an imperfect development. There they came in contact with the gentle Anabaptists, who held the same principle in a more consistent form, and immediately, under this tuition, the larger part of them became Baptists. Just so was it an hundred years later, when Jona-

* Life of Dr. Belknap, by his Grand-daughter, p. 207.

than Edwards arose in New-England, the reäserter of those doctrines of a spiritual church. Great had been the defection in New-England. Alliance with the State, and the Half-Way Covenant, had made the churches little more than worldly corporations, and a lax theology was likely to complete the ruin so begun. Edwards felt the pressure of this terrible drift, and met it with a reäffirmation of the great and potent truth that Christian churches are spiritual churches, separated from the world by the decisive marks of regeneration by the Spirit of God, and a lively faith uniting the believer personally to Christ. How these doctrines were frowned upon by the worldly, and how they were welcomed by the spiritual, the records of those times fully attest. But there was latent within them a power which Edwards did not see. If such was the nature of Christian churches, where was the room within them for infants incapable of personal faith, and under what plea could they be made subjects of that rite by which believers were originally admitted into the sacred fellowship? These questions followed immediately on the publication of Edwards's views. There was a demand for churches which should consistently embody them, and in the few small and feeble Baptist churches which here and there in New-England sent forth a faint and flickering light, were soon discovered copies which answered to the original patterns drawn in the word of God. The consistent organization of these principles followed as a necessary result of their promulgation. The King in Zion, reigning over subjects whose vow of allegiance is personal and voluntary, they will associate themselves under the exact provisions of his statute-book. Their churches will be composed of believers only, because believers only composed the churches of the New Testament, and the mode of admission will be, not the immaterial question of much or of little water, but the vital one of literal obedience to their Lord and Master. These were the new phases of religious controversy in New-England. Everywhere in that section of the country these questions were agitated, and Baptist churches sprung up with a rapidity which can have no explanation except that which is found in the power of their principles.

Nor was the power of these principles confined to New-England. In the Middle and Southern Colonies, borne thither by men who took the sacred infection in New-England, their working was modified by other ecclesiastical antagonisms, but was not less effective. The Episcopacy of Virginia was in a decline far below the Congregationalism of Massachusetts, and the doctrines of spiritual churches came to the people with the freshness and power of a new revelation. In the presence of these doctrines and of their triumphs, the Old Establishment of Virginia trembled and fell, as Dagon did in the presence of the Ark of God.

The Annals of Dr. Sprague cover the period of this remarkable propagandism. A large proportion of the ministers whose lives and labors are here commemorated, were themselves brought into Baptist churches by the force of these principles, and became in their turn the instruments of their further triumphs. Their lives, therefore, illustrate the power of these principles in a double way. They indicate, moreover, the methods and conditions of the further outspreading growth of our churches. The American churches, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal, are all, theoretically and practically, nearer to our views by far than they were a century ago; but neither do their formularies nor their actual tendencies warrant the hope of that close conformity to the Apostolic pattern which we believe characteristic of our own principles and polity. Our work is not done. If it is to be done at all, it is to be done by the full consciousness of the power of our principles, and by the vigorous promulgation of them. Is it not the case that those principles were more thoroughly understood and appreciated by these fathers than they are by us; and shall we not be more likely, under God, to renew their efficiency by analyzing their characters, and making ourselves more familiar with the records of their achievements? Not for sectarian ends do we desire this continued propagandism, but in the full belief that the occasions which justified the rise of the denomination, justify and require its continuance; that the Church of Christ is composed of spiritual persons only, and that its power in the great work of the

world's regeneration will be fully known, only when it comes back to this primitive idea, and applies itself to its work with the zeal of that Apostolic Church of which it will then be the copy.

These Annals are in like manner remarkable as illustrating the educating force of Christianity — of Christianity in the heart as a vital, energizing principle. Every pastor who has observed the religious growth of members of his own church, has been impressed with the intellectual development by which that growth has been marked. He has seen men and women of humble capacity, of humble associations and employments, on becoming devout and earnest Christians, rising to a higher sphere of intellectual life, their minds grasping loftier conceptions, and their language, always the closely fitting dress of thought, assuming forms of corresponding growth. He has felt, on witnessing these phenomena, that the redemption in Christ reaches the whole human soul, and sets it apart for a divine service. Every thoughtful reader of Christian biography has been similarly impressed by records of conversion in humble life. Who can read that beautiful narrative, the *Dairyman's Daughter*, without observing in it an illuminated intellect as well as a sanctified heart? Who can read the life and writings of the glorious Dreamer of Bedford, without feeling that that grace which led him a penitent to the cross, was in like manner the inspiration which made him compeer with Milton in the triumphs of genius? * Indeed, that compound of truth and fable which represents the Saxon Caedmon first a stolid menial and then bard of the Christian Church, seems well-nigh type and prophecy, not alone of such a life as Bunyan's, but of the general results of Christianity as an educating force in the human soul. Perhaps we can explain these phenomena in part. A Christian life raises the soul to the contemplation of the greatest themes which can exercise its powers, — to thoughts of God, of the Incarnation, of Redemption, of Immortality. If the soul grows by exercise, how must themes like these accelerate the growth?

* Macaulay.

Whether, however, we can explain the phenomena or not, they cannot be doubted as actual results of the inworking of Christianity in the heart.

In the volume before us results of this character are illustrated on a grand and impressive scale. When the Baptist denomination in this country commenced about a century ago its marvellous growth, — when its churches sprung up here, and there, and everywhere, with a rapidity scarcely paralleled in the history of modern ecclesiastical events, — the people who shared in this movement could not draw upon Colleges or Theological Seminaries for ministers of their faith. Of Theological Seminaries there were none in existence, and the few Colleges which had then been established in the Colonies, were possessed and used by their opponents. They were cast, therefore, upon their own resources, and they sought out among themselves for the sacred office men giving evidence of a divine call to that service. True, their records prove them to have been by no means indifferent to the question of an educated ministry, nor were there wanting among them, at any time, more or less of ministers who had had advantages of education. But a supply of educated ministers was an impossibility. They accepted with joyfulness such as God gave them. They established Brown University in 1764, and a half a century later commenced the establishment of that long list of Colleges and Theological Seminaries which they have since called into being. But this process was a slow one compared with our denominational growth, and the greater proportion of our ministers, even to the present day, have of necessity proceeded to their work without opportunities of high culture.

This volume, therefore, is the record of such a ministry. Many of its names illustrate the highest general and professional learning of our times, but the far greater number are of men who went to their great tasks with only the limited education of the public schools, or with this and a few brief months of private theological instruction. We ask the reader, bearing these facts in mind, to study the lives here recorded. He will find these men lamenting this lack of culture, yet

rising under every possible difficulty to the necessities of every emergency, and attaining a measure of intellectual power which can have its adequate explanation only in the educating force of Christianity itself. He who called them to their work, gave them the ability to perform it well. Studying few books, they studied these thoroughly. Most of all, they meditated the profound truths of theology, bringing the writings of Gill and Booth, of Edwards and Fuller, to the tests found in the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. They meditated their own personal experiences, and preached the religion they had felt. They were devout men, abounding in that kind of prayer in which the human soul rises to intimate converse with God. Eternity was to them a reality, and their contemplations of it gave a profound and serious earnestness to their lives. Performing missionary journeys, they prepared sermons while riding through forests which separated the settlements of pioneers; a point of conscience with them to be always ready to preach, they attained a measure of skill in preparation, and of facility in utterance, which gave them the apostolic qualification of aptness to teach. Their education was not *for* the ministry but *in* it, and such as it was, it was the remarkable product of consecration to Christ, and illustrated, as in the case of John Bunyan, the power of Christianity to redeem and exalt the intellect as well as the heart.

Closely related to this last topic is another, on which this volume is equally instructive,—that the power of the Christian ministry as a means of the world's conversion, so far as it is a human power, lies in its specific consecration to that end. The estimable author of this volume exercises his ministry in a branch of the Christian Church which has been accustomed to regard liberal learning as very nearly an essential qualification for the office of a Christian minister. We have no information as to the fact, but we can well suppose that the collection and preparation of the materials of which the volume is composed, must have brought to his mind frequently the question,—How is it that this great body of ministers, a small proportion only of whom have been distinguished by scholarship, have attained an average of usefulness which constitutes

them an example in that particular? We think that question will force itself irresistibly on any intelligent reader, who studies the book from that point of view. If an inference is drawn unfavorable to the desirableness or importance of human learning as an aid to the Christian minister, the inference will be a mistake. That is not the lesson. It was indeed a marvellous work which these men, and the unrecorded compeers whom they represent, were called, about one hundred years ago, to undertake and to accomplish. They achieved an ecclesiastical, a social, and a political revolution,—the last two as incidents and consequences of the first. Fewest and feeblest of the tribes of the American Israel at the era of the Great Awakening, their lives covered the period in which the Baptist denomination became as numerous as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians combined. Depressed socially and politically by the power of opposing numbers and by the intolerance of Religious Establishments, the denomination rose from that depression to social equality, and became the chief agent of Providence in accomplishing that total separation of the Church from the State, which is the crowning distinction and glory of the American Republic. Of movements and changes so vast, these men were leaders and champions. The question comes back, What was the secret of their power? The answer is, their specific consecration to the conversion of men. The theology which they believed, and felt, and preached, was a theology which abased man as a sinner and exalted Christ as a Savior,—which made faith, a religious profession, and a religious life, personal matters,—which placed individual souls in conscious responsibility to God, and made the Judgment, and Heaven, and Hell awful verities of immediate concern,—and they watched for souls as those that must give account. Their experiences of divine truth were profound and distinct, and they preached those experiences as earnest men, content with nothing short of similar experiences in other souls. A sermon was not a formal essay of a stated hour, but an out-gushing, fervent appeal to sinful men to be reconciled to God. The great outward phenomena in the structure of society which resulted from their

ministry, came as the fruits of changes in convictions, feelings, aims, and hopes. Some of them were called to turn partially aside from this spiritual work, to aid the deliverance of their brethren from political oppression. Backus, John and Aaron Leland, Baldwin, and others, were distinguished as advocates of the equality of all denominations before the law; and whether vindicating their religious rights by the pen or in the halls of legislation, they were characterized by that same directness and earnestness of purpose, by which they were distinguished in the performance of ministerial duties. They accomplished great results because they sought them as the engrossing purposes of their souls. Consecrated to the world's conversion, as the primary and all-comprehending idea of their lives, they became men of power by virtue of that consecration.

If it is asked whether the men whose services are here recorded, might not have accomplished vastly more, with advantages of learning, we answer, undoubtedly,—provided their consecration and zeal had been the same. It is the business of education to train and furnish the powers of the human soul for their work. When education becomes an end, and not a means, it has little value beyond what it does for the individual himself;—when it becomes a means, rather than an end, and in proportion as it becomes a means, it transforms itself into a vital energy whose force it is impossible to measure. What marvels in culture, under every possible disadvantage, were accomplished by many of the worthies of this volume, and, then, how these toilsome studies became to them new elements of spiritual power! We have already spoken of the illustrations here furnished of the power of Christianity to quicken and exalt the intellect;—the illustrations are not less striking of what may be achieved in intellectual culture, under whatever difficulties, by consecrated men thirsting for knowledge, which they might use in labors for Christ.

Indeed, we regard this volume as illustrating strikingly the truth and value of those views of the relations of human learning to the duties of the Christian ministry, which are hereditary in the Baptist denomination. We have insisted on giv-

ing grace the precedence of learning, but we have recognized and proclaimed the desirableness of learning as the complement and aid of grace. These relations of grace and learning have been maintained throughout our entire history. They are the true relations, and we shall be shorn of our power when we decline from our historical creed on this point, and reverse this divinely-sanctioned order. It is not to be denied that we are in danger as to this point. There is a tendency in scholarship to withdraw from the world, and to pursue ends in itself. It is the danger not of Professors in Colleges and Theological Seminaries alone, but of their pupils as well. It is the danger, too, of the scholarly pastor, who may, by yielding to the temptation, degenerate to the mere student, and so become recreant to his vows, and a traitor to the souls committed to his charge. He *has* yielded to the temptation when all which he has acquired is not brought into requisition to make him a more powerful, more effective, and more successful preacher of the gospel. If he has less sympathy for human life, less relish for vital contact with it in his work, less power to reach and move its shifting phases, he is already far gone. He needs a new baptism of the Holy Ghost, which shall consecrate him, with all his learning, afresh to Christ, and to his service in saving the souls of men. Such a man may turn to this volume with profit. He will here see how much more they achieved who put grace first, then learning;—who with sometimes little of the latter were still men of power because they had much of the former;—and he will learn that his scholarship is valueless as ashes, only as he uses it just as they used their humbler acquisitions, to make him more a man of power over the hearts and lives of men.

We shall call the attention of the reader to one more lesson suggested by the records contained in this work,—the importance to the Christian minister, as a condition of success, of well-defined and Scriptural views of doctrinal theology. True, the lesson is taught not here alone. It is the lesson of all Christian history. In the very earliest period of the Christian Church, in the very times of the Apostles, the grandest achievements of Christianity were contemporaneous with the approx-

imation of evangelical truth to scientific forms. The writings of Paul contain more than the facts out of which to evolve a theological system. They include such a system. Augustine, Calvin, Edwards and Fuller, have done little more than define, and put in relations, the science contained, not potentially, but actually, in the New Testament. In the doctrines which constitute that science, has been lodged in all ages, alike the true unity and the real power of the Church of Christ. Amid manifold forms, amid strange heresies of sacerdotal power, these doctrines, the Tri-Unity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Forgiveness of Sins, Regeneration and Effectual Grace, have been the centres of truth to which believing hearts have turned, and the secrets of power in great men and in great movements, through the whole history of the Christian Church. It pleased God to deposit their full share in this inheritance of historical theology, with the founders and fathers of the Baptist denomination. Anterior to the Savoy Confession, anterior to the Westminster, they embodied it in the Confession of the Seven Churches in 1643. Still later they reëffirmed their unity in doctrine, not with Dissent alone, not with Protestantism alone, but with the Christian Theology of all ages, in the Confession of 1689. That Confession crossing the Atlantic, and declared in the American Colonies, by the Philadelphia, the Charleston and the Warren Associations, oldest of our organized representative bodies, became the recognized doctrinal symbol of the great mass of American Baptists. How well it was understood in the heroic period of our history, how clearly defined and made an element of power in preaching, may be inferred from records of ministerial fidelity and success which are found in these pages. We apprehend that in these latter days, when the increase of Christian literature is characterized by a decline of doctrinal explicitness and power, there is a generation of ministers and of laity growing up, who have no idea, either of our historical theology, or of those marvels of grace of which it was the instrument, in the hands of a race of preachers now departed. We commend to such the study of this volume. And if they need a further incitement, we refer them to that wonderful

preacher, in whom, in our own day, the preaching of doctrinal theology is restored, in forms which draw the listening ears of great multitudes, and make his name familiar wherever the English language is spoken. Himself successor in the pastoral office of one of the most venerable signers of the Confession of 1689, he declares the theology of that Confession, with an unreserve which leaves no room for question as to his meaning, or as to the sincerity of his faith in what he preaches; — and, not in his voice or manner, not in his language or oratorical skill, but in the substance of his preaching, lies his power. This the Holy Spirit owns, and thousands, thus early in his marvellous ministry, have been by him led to Christ. The power of the fathers whose lives are recorded in this volume, was a similar power. Their success rested on similar conditions. It will be restored when the same conditions are again fulfilled. We do not say that they have never erred. We may even admit that sometimes, certain doctrines, misapprehended, or urged out of relations, resulted mischievously. We are forced in truth to admit this. But the general statements of their power which we have made, will still remain true, and our simple duty will be to copy the wisdom and efficiency of their methods, and to avoid their errors.

We part with this volume with the expression of an earnest desire that it may be diffused universally among our churches.

ARTICLE V.—THOMSON'S LOGIC.

An Outline of the Necessary Laws of Thought: A Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By WILLIAM THOMSON, D. D., Provost of the Queen's College, Oxford. From the Fourth London Edition. Pp. 345, 16mo. New-York: Sheldon & Co., 1859.

THIS is a singularly neat re-print of a valuable English work. The original was first published in 1842, and was immediately recognized as an independent and able treatise, by Sir Wm. Hamilton and those who were laboring with him in the revival of interest for the sadly neglected science of Logic. Of this revival, which may be said to date from the first publication of Dr. Whately's *Logic*, in London, in 1829, Dr. Thomson's book is at once a consequence and cause. Adopted as a class-book in several places of education at home, it has passed into a fourth edition, which was issued in 1857, and from this the present re-print is made. We are glad to notice, in an advertisement of the American publishers, that it has been already introduced as a text-book in Harvard University, in New-York University, and in the University of Rochester. We think it admirably adapted to such use. Concise, yet clear, even to transparency; thorough and complete, yet brief; level with the literature and the present discussions of the science, yet free from controversy; indicating the influence of a sound Logic on a true Philosophy, and indicating the innumerable points where Logic osculates the various fields of knowledge, yet confined with a jealous care to its peculiar office. So far as we can discover, Dr. Thomson has written in the interest of no school in philosophy, but has conscientiously aimed at a clear statement of the principles and limits of the science. This is no small praise. We know of nothing equal to this *Outline* to put into the hands of the student, as an aid and guide in

the prelections and discussions* of the lecture-room, and as showing where the details of the study may be more fully pursued.

We do not coincide with Dr. Thomson in all his positive doctrines, although we are at one with him as to the extent and office of Logic. After a brief exposition of this office and extent, we shall endeavor, from his own principles, to vindicate our dissent from him.

I. Logic has been variously defined. By recent writers, at least, where the name has exercised an etymological influence on the definition, there has been a determination toward one of two contrasted opinions, according as the word *λόγος* (*logos*) has been viewed in its rhetorical or in its psychological aspect. *Λόγος* means either the unspoken or the spoken word, — either the inward thought, *ratio*; or the outward expression for the inward thought, *oratio*. Hence, as one or the other signification preponderates, Logic may claim to preside over thought itself and to exhibit the necessary laws of all its movements; or simply to be occupied with expressed thought, and, as its principal office, to guard the purity of the syllogism. The latter is the view taken by Dr. Whately;† the former is that held by Dr. Thomson, after Sir Wm. Hamilton. We would not be understood as saying that either process gives a science equally self-consistent and self-sufficient. We do not think it does; but this suggests at the outset the fundamental character of the difficulties and discussions which divide and occupy logicians, as also the value of clearness in defining the sphere of any science, and of method in its development.

Inasmuch as we never think without some object of thought, there are two things in every act of thinking, to either of

* "There is nothing in regard to which notions cruder, narrower, or more erroneous prevail, than in regard to Disputation, — its nature, its objects, its ends; nay, I make bold to say that by no academical degeneracy has the intellectual vigor of youth lost more than through the desuetude into which, during these latter ages, Disputation, as a regular and daily exercise in our Universities, has fallen." — *Sir Wm. Hamilton's Reid*, p. 706, note.

† Not that Dr. Whately is singular in this; but he is, perhaps, the best representative we have of the common doctrine.

which special attention may be directed—the process of the thought itself, and the object toward which the thought is proceeding. We may pursue either course, whatever the mental act in which we are engaged,—whether forming conceptions of individual objects; or comparing conceptions, as to their agreement or disagreement, and so forming judgments; or comparing judgments, and inferring their mutual inclusion or exclusion or total want of relation. When we pursue the first course,—*i. e.* bestow special attention on the thinking act itself, we are in the domain of *pure* Logic, which Dr. Thomson defines to be “the science of the necessary laws of thought in their own nature.”* In this domain we simply ask, Are our conceptions clear or obscure? Are our judgments of agreement or of disagreement between the compared conceptions? Are our inferences correctly or incorrectly drawn from the premises? When we pursue the second course,—*i. e.* bestow special attention on the object about which the thinking act is employed, we are in the domain of *applied* logic, which Dr. Thomson defines to be “the science of the necessary laws of thought as employed in attaining truth.”† In this domain we ask, Are our conceptions of real or of imaginary objects? Are our judgments, and the inferences from them, true or false? This distinction between pure and applied logic is “analogous to that which is drawn between Anatomy and Physiology, the former of which simply examines what are the parts of the human frame, and the latter—the science of Life—dwells upon the uses and developments of the parts.”‡

As already stated, those who consider Logic chiefly from the side toward Rhetoric—as does Dr. Whately—would define it to be the science and art (one or both) of reasoning. This breaks down the distinction between pure and applied Logic, and renders the science itself incomplete—*i. e.* denies to it the possibility of being a *pure* science at all. For, while “the laws of thought themselves are few in number, and lie, in examples of perpetual occurrence, under every thinking man’s observation,” the objects upon which thought is employed are innumerable. But the “science of reasoning”

* Page 21.

† Ibid.

‡ Page 20.

must include both the process and its objects, and hence can never hope for completeness.

There is another and more capital deficiency involved in this view of Logic. Unless we give to the word "reasoning" an unwarrantable latitude of meaning, no provision is made within the sphere of Logic for the processes of the mind preliminary to that act, — that is, the processes in forming either conceptions or judgments. Hence, the system has a fundamental lack in self-sufficiency, and some very important mental operations are declared unworthy in themselves of a scientific home, for if they do not belong to Logic as essential and constituent parts, they belong nowhere. No modern writer, indeed, who holds this view of the science, excludes conceptions and judgments from his consideration, or denies that they are necessary and preliminary to reasoning proper, but this consideration is obviously extralogical and inconsistent. The necessity which compels their introduction ought to suggest that the basis and boundaries of Logic from which they are excluded are too narrow.

Recalling, now, Dr. Thomson's definition, that Logic is the "science of the necessary laws of thought," we are struck by the simplicity, completeness, and even grandeur of the study thus presented. "When we attend to the procedure of the human intellect we soon perceive that it is subject to certain supreme laws which are independent of the variable matter of our ideas, and which, posited in their abstract generality, express the absolute and fixed rules, not only of the human intellect, but of all thought, whatever be the subject which frames it or the object which it concerns. To determine those universal laws of thought in general, in order that the human mind in particular may find in all its researches a means of control, and an infallible criterion of the legitimacy of its procedure, is the object of logic." "Logic is the science of the laws of thought as thought, — that is, of the necessary conditions to which thought, considered in itself, is subject."* Surely, to state the object of such a science is sufficient to vin-

* See Fleming's Vocabulary of Philosophy, word "Logic." Sir Wm. Hamilton's Reid, p. 698, b, note f.

dicate its importance and its utility, if the science itself be possible. And if there can be any science at all, there can be of the processes of thought. Nay, such a science there must be, as the condition (*conditio sine quâ non*) of any and of all others; for only through the assured legitimacy of our mental processes can be verified our results in whatever field of knowledge.

Upon this definition and view of Logic rests the postulate which controls the science throughout. *Whatever is thought implicitly, we must be able to express explicitly.* Here emerges Sir Wm. Hamilton's New Analytic, which has occasioned the greatest modification and enlargement of the science since the days of Aristotle, its founder. It involves the quantification of the predicate in all propositions; the increase of the number of propositional forms from four to eight; the increase of the number of syllogistic moods from nineteen to one hundred and eight; the abolition of the fourth figure of the syllogism, etc.* Dr. Thomson accepts Sir Wm. Hamilton's definition and postulate, but doubts if they lead to such extreme results. He finds six propositional forms, which, by rejecting the fourth figure, yield sixty-two valid moods.

II. Having thus stated the germinal principle of Dr. Thomson's treatise, we would object to his doctrine of Immediate Inference, as at once incongruous with his theory of Logic and false in itself. After stating that ordinarily we need a middle term with which to compare the subject and predicate of a proposition before we can pronounce upon their agreement or disagreement, he says; "But, sometimes, instead of a third term, differing entirely from the other two, the premise only need contain the two terms of the conclusion, or some modification of them."† This seems, also, to be a doctrine of Sir Wm. Hamilton. We do not understand how it can be. An

* We simply suggest these questions, this being all that is required for our present purpose. Any discussion of them would be premature before the publication of Sir Wm. Hamilton's Lectures in Logic, which is now anxiously awaited.

† Page 175.

immediate inference from a proposition, within the scientific meaning of these terms in *Logic*, appears to us a contradiction. A proposition, like a physical fact, stands for itself alone, and is fruitless, save as it goes forth into new relations; but each of these new relations would require its own proposition to express it, and thus is supplied the two premises for every valid conclusion. There is, hence, no act of reasoning with less than three terms. The philosophical demand for a plurality of causes conspiring to the production of any event in nature is no more imperative than is the demand for a plurality—at least a duality—of propositions to yield a conclusion in *Logic*. Let us take Dr. Thomson's example, "All good rulers are just." From this he gets, by immediate inference, "No unjust rulers are good." He is right in insisting that it is no objection to this second proposition, as an inference from the first, that there is no new truth in it. The same may undoubtedly be said of the conclusion to every argument; it brings in nothing, if it be valid or of any force, which was not virtually asserted in the premises. But, for all that, is this a case of immediate inference? Does the "passing of the one make it possible, without further observation or decision upon facts, to collect the other?" Having given the assertive judgment, "All good rulers are just," what must we do before we can pronounce the negative judgment, "No unjust rulers can be good?" We agree with Dr. Thomson that it is not a case of bare repetition; if it were, the judgments would, of course, be identical, and there would be no inference at all. We must substitute the corresponding negative terms in the subject and predicate of the first proposition, before we can pronounce the second. But can we lawfully do this? The legitimacy of this procedure may be shown in several ways. From our definition of *Logic* we may deduce that every proposition is an equation between subject and predicate; hence, if we introduce a negative into each member we do not destroy the equipoise. Or, we may recur to the theory of privative conceptions, and base our inference on the self-evident truth that what we include in a given conception cannot, at the same time, be excluded from it; or that a con-

ception and its privative are mutually exclusive. We venture the affirmation, that every case of so-called immediate inference, which is not mere repetition, involves the introduction of an axiom in thinking or an assumed postulate, and the question, "Why is this inference legitimate?" will always bring the latent premise to light. The movement is rapid, and the intermediate steps are not ordinarily noticed, but it is the precise office of Logic to reveal them. Whatever is implicitly thought is to be explicitly stated. We would here include Dr. Thomson within his own complaint, that "logicians have generally erred on the side of underrating both the number of the mental processes themselves, and of the particular acts which go to the attainment of any judgment or conception."*

We have dwelt upon this error of Immediate Inference, for it seems to us the capital one of the book, and affects the phraseology and the reasoning in a number of places. We are not wholly satisfied with some changes in nomenclature, which is always an important matter in a scientific treatise. "Major" and "minor," as designating the terms of the conclusion, are rejected, and "subject" and "predicate" used in their stead. We feel the incongruity of the old names with the new view of Logic, when we have regard to the intension as well as the extension of terms; but the substituted names produce confusion, for the premises of a syllogism have each a subject and predicate equally with the conclusion. Again, instead of "major" and "minor" premises, Dr. Thomson would say "first" and "second." But the "first" premise is not always first in the order of statement, and if these expressions are used in other than their literal meaning, in what do they differ from those for which they are commuted?

In the brief space allotted us, we have endeavored to bring before our readers the fundamental position of Dr. Thomson as to the scope and claim of Logic, and his chief mistake, through what we regard as forgetfulness of his fundamental position. We have preferred this to descanting upon the details of the work, as it will help each one to form his own estimate. There are not wanting striking excellencies in the special

* Page 75.

treatment of the integral questions of the science. We might specify the discussions concerning the relation of language to thought; the nature of general notions, with the hints bearing on the history of nominalism and realism; the value of a proper method in our investigations, and the way of securing it. The insertion of Sir. Wm. Hamilton's scheme of syllogistic notation, and of Prof. Max Müller's essay on Indian Logic, increases the value of the book.

From a somewhat careful inquiry, we are satisfied that there is still entirely too little attention given to the study of Logic in our American Colleges. There is a strong prejudice in the minds of many—diminishing, but not yet removed—against the science, which of course affects it unfavorably. But the object of Logic is nothing less than “the legislation of thought; and if the laws and processes which it displays be unimportant and uninteresting, they are the laws and processes by and through which, and which alone, what is nearest to us and noblest in creation executes its marvels.”* “We can no more reason without making syllogisms, than we can speak and argue without forming sentences. What Grammar does for speech, Logic does for thought.”† If, therefore, a knowledge of the laws of language will assist one in speaking correctly, a knowledge of the laws of thought will be no less serviceable in reasoning correctly. We need protection against the sophistry we practice upon ourselves and that put upon us in the verbal juggling and glittering rhetoric of others, and this protection can be in no way so well furnished as by thorough discipline in the principles of Logic.

While we thus specially recommend Dr. Thomson's work to educators, there are many in active life—particularly in the ministry—who have never had the advantage of scholastic training, who would find their advantage in its careful study.

We think the value of the book would be increased to the American student, if it had a judiciously prepared introductory chapter—explaining some unexplained terms, and pointing out precisely the difference between this and the common theory of Logic,—and a selection of examples for logical analysis.

* Sir Wm. Hamilton's Reid, p. 698—note.

† Thomson, p. 283.

ARTICLE VI.—RELATION OF ROMANS, I: 18—23, TO
THE GENERAL ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE.

OF the composition of the Church of Rome at the date of the writing of this Epistle, there is but little room for difference of opinion. Expressions in the letter itself, as well as other testimonies, make it evident that the majority of the Christian membership at Rome were of Gentile origin, (see chap. i: 5, 6; xi: 13, 14; xv: 15, 16,) but that, as in most of the churches of the first age, there was a large and influential body of converts from the Jewish Synagogue. (See chaps. iii and iv, and ix—xi.) The Jews, including doubtless Jewish Christians, had indeed been expelled from Rome during the latter part of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, but they gathered back under the mild beginning of the reign of Nero, and the church had regained the Jewish portion of its membership before the writing of the Epistle to the Romans.

The *occasion* of writing the letter is not quite so patent. Alford supposes it to have been the rumor, reaching the Apostle, of ill-adjusted questions between the Jewish and Gentile constituents of the body. Olshausen, however, vigorously combats this opinion, and we think he has shewn that there are not sufficient reasons for entertaining it. At the same time, he seems to us to allow too little to the Judaizing element in the church at Rome.

The *aim* of the Epistle is to discuss, thoroughly and practically, the fact of the universality of man's guiltiness before God, and the doctrine of God's free, justifying grace in Christ, the only and the common ground of hope for mankind. By this two-fold thread of thought, the reader of this Epistle is lead, through painful exposures of heathen depravity and

Jewish short-comings, to the setting forth of the co-heirship of the penitent and believing of both parties in the love and promises of God in Christ Jesus.

Such being the general object of this letter, it is manifest that all its main thoughts will be related to that object. They will have a logical connection with it. Any interpretation of a given passage that does not naturally connect itself with the main theme; any interpretation that introduces a far-fetched and irrelevant subject, must, for that reason alone, be rejected. Paul, it is admitted, introduced into all his Epistles many thoughts subordinate to his main subject, and even pursued them, parenthetically, to great length; but those subordinate paragraphs were always suggested by his general theme, and they never introduced an important subject alien to that. In the passage under consideration, moreover, there are no characteristics of a parenthesis. The thought of the paragraph is not at all subordinate to the subject under discussion, but constitutes one of the links in a regular, unbroken chain of argumentation. The great argument of the Apostle is justification by faith, and, as a necessary preliminary to that, *the guiltiness and condemnation of the world of mankind in both its great lines of historical development, Gentile and Jewish*. The plan of God's justifying righteousness implies the deepest moral necessities on the part of the human race; and to the setting forth of those necessities, Paul, like a true reasoner, first directs his pen. Why, in the course of this argument, and at the very commencement of it, is this particular and most weighty paragraph introduced? What is the precise and full import of the passage in the connection?

It may be worth while to collect a few of the statements of commentators in answer to this question.

Tholuck (intro. to Rom. ii) says: "The heathen are sinners, because they have allowed the knowledge of God, *which they bring into the world*, to be suppressed," &c. Again, in his analysis of the argument of chap. i, he says: "In the first place, the heathen stand in need of the gospel, inasmuch as they lie under the threatenings of God's penal justice for having, contrary to the dictates of *the Divine revelation within*

them, denied the true nature of God," &c. This is Tholuck's answer to the question propounded. To our mind, it is far from satisfactory. For it assumes a point concerning the correctness of which there is more than a shade of doubt. It assumes that man is born with what the distinguished writer elsewhere denominates "a slumbering consciousness of God," which may be awakened, by a contemplation of the order of nature and the course of providence, into a distinct apprehension of the Divine Being and attributes. But such language as above quoted, however it may be received amongst the theological schools of Germany, will hardly find an affirmative response from the religious thinkers of this country. Such expressions as "the consciousness of God," and "the Divine revelation within man," may be considered as out of date and unmeaning; and the thought that underlies them cannot be admitted as a satisfactory explanation of the purpose of Paul in the paragraph under consideration. And besides, in making the above answer, Tholuck, like many other writers on the passage before us, seems to lose sight of the most important fact that the Apostle was not speaking of contemporary Gentileism merely—not of the Gentileism of his day and of the Roman Empire alone as it lay before his eye in actual debasement and ignorance—but rather was speaking of historical Gentileism, Gentileism running back through all the previous centuries of history to its earliest origin in the first departure from the true worship of God. To *this* fact, which was mainly in the mind of the Apostle, but which seems to have been very slightly present to the mind of Tholuck, as it has been to the minds of so many other commentators on Romans, we shall have occasion to make frequent and emphatic reference.

Olshausen, in answering the question we have raised, says: "In describing the necessity of a new way of salvation for the heathen world, the Apostle naturally set out with considering their degraded moral condition. But it was also required that this state of alienation from God should be traced to its origin. Even the Gentile world was not without some knowledge of God, and in consequence some insight into the divine law;

but the knowledge which was thus within their reach, the Gentiles lost by their own fault, and, with their theoretical errors, the stream of their practical transgressions rose to a most fearful height. The mere recovery of that general knowledge of God, which they once possessed, could, of course, effect nothing in this evil case, for if it had not been effectual in preventing them from sinking into vice, still less could it raise the mass from the slough of iniquity into which it had fallen; it was therefore necessary that a new element of life, a Divine power, (*δύναμις θεοῦ*,) should be introduced into the world, which should render possible a new beginning for man; such the gospel proved itself to be." (Vol. iii, page 484, Kendrick's edition.)

This extract seems to us to be a comprehensive and just statement of the Apostle's purpose in writing Romans, i: 18, sq. All that we shall have to say on the passage will be but little more than the confirmation and illustration of this quotation. It expresses precisely and felicitously the view that for some years we have held in regard to the relation of the paragraph under review to the general discussion of the Epistle.

When, however, Olshausen proceeds to comment on particular words and clauses, it is in such a way as either to conflict with his above general definition of Paul's doctrine, or else to necessitate another interpretation of his words than the obvious one. In the foregoing extract, Olshausen *seems* to refer to a knowledge of God possessed by the heathen in their early history, a knowledge that must have been communicated to them by a direct revelation from God, a knowledge which, with the light shed upon it from the works of God, was sufficient to have preserved the Gentiles from their gross errors, and for the loss of which, in the course of their history, they were morally responsible and guilty. Such, beyond controversy, we think, was *the fact* in the case—a fact that gives us the key to the interpretation of much Scripture, and for the unlocking of the secret of much history—and this fact *seems* to be distinctly recognized in the passage quoted from Olshausen. When, however, he comes to comment on the statement in v. 19, that God had revealed himself to the

heathen, it is in language that appears not altogether consistent with the foregoing. He says: "It is stated (by Paul i. e.) that the knowledge of God *is founded upon the manifestation of the Divine energy.*" This comment is made on the declaration of the Apostle, that "the knowledge of God is manifest amongst them, for God made it manifest to them," (the historic aörist,) viz., in remote times, in the early periods of their history. Now, from the declaration that God once manifested the knowledge of himself to the Gentile world, it seems not to be very conclusively inferred that "the knowledge of God is *founded upon* the manifestation of the Divine energy," and the remark is certainly in conflict with the general view of this writer, as already given.

Again, Olshausen says: "We can point to no manifestation of Deity, either immediate or by angels, to the Gentile world, such as was vouchsafed to the Jews; but God revealed himself to them by his creation from the very beginning." Now, in this and kindred statements, wherein Olshausen is at one with so many of our most learned expositors of Scripture, a very narrow view, as it seems to us, is taken of the scope of the Apostle's language. The then present of Gentileism, when there was, and for fifteen hundred years had been, a distinction between Jew and Gentile, is allowed to shut out of view the whole antediluvian history of mankind, as well as their history from the deluge to the calling of Abraham, or, more properly, to the erecting of his posterity into a nationality—by far the larger section of the world's history before the Apostle's day. The Apostle, on the contrary, as is evident from his expression, ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, had in view the whole past of human history, including all those generations wherein direct revelations *had been* made to the Gentile world. And it was merely as a means of corroborating and illustrating the original revelation of God to man, not as an explanation of the origin of the idea of God, that Paul referred to the works of creation. Given the fact that God originally, and for a long time from the first, communicated himself to mankind by immediate revelation, as he most certainly did, and that *ever since* he had been passing before the nations in manifesta-

tions of his power and goodness—given these two facts, the heathen were inexcusable for having lost the knowledge, and corrupted the worship of the true God. This is the Apostle's argument. He does not reproach and condemn the Gentiles for not having risen, through a contemplation of nature, to the knowledge and obedience of God, but for having wasted their primitive knowledge of him whilst the corroborating testimonies of creation and providence were before them. Olshausen, however, like many of his erudite countrymen, was misled by that unhistorical figment concerning some innate consciousness of God, capable of being awakened by contact with outward nature into a distinct conception of the Divine Being and attributes.

True, Olshausen elsewhere drops expressions that apparently recognize both the necessity and the fact of an original revelation to the heathen world, other than that which every man has within him, or which his senses convey to him from the phenomena of nature—expressions that apparently recognize the traditional character of the religious ideas of the Gentile world. The same is also true of Tholuck. Some of these expressions we may have occasion to quote in another connection.

It will be needless to multiply commentators who have answered the question propounded, substantially as Tholuck and Olshausen have done. Any one acquainted with the literature of the subject, knows that the list could be extended almost indefinitely, and made to embrace a vast number, both ancient and modern, who coincide generally in the position of these writers. With minor differences in the details of their exposition, they agree in this main idea: that the Apostle meant to set forth the guiltiness of the Gentile races, *on the ground of their disregard of the appeal of God to their consciences, through the works of his hands alone*. They suppose the Apostle to have contemplated the opportunities and the responsibilities of the heathen, under the conditions of a total exclusion from any direct and special communication from God, as left without any light from a written or oral revelation, and that on that ground alone he pronounced their condemnation.

It is, we hope, with a becoming modesty that we venture to set forth a somewhat different exposition of the Apostle's thought in the passage under review—an exposition that has found, at least in its main position, a few advocates, and one that we cannot but cling to as not only more consonant with the *whole* connection of the passage, but one that more abundantly magnifies the grace of God towards all his fallen creatures, and sets in a stronger light the guiltiness of the ancient Gentile world.

The central and most pregnant sin of heathenism, the *πρῶτον ἐξῆδος* of the Gentile races, in the Apostle's estimation, as shown in the passage before us and its connection, was IDOLATRY. This was the bitter root from which were borne all those fruits of moral evil catalogued in the latter part of the first chapter of Romans. This sin was the primal apostacy, or "falling away" from God. It was a departure from that first and greatest commandment, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow thyself down to them, nor serve them." This great commandment, covering the first table of the Mosaic law, was in full and universal force before the Decalogue was written; it belonged to that ecumenical code binding man to the supreme worship of God from the beginning of the race; and it was the defection of the nations from their allegiance to this command that constituted, in Paul's view, the most grievous ground of accusation against them. This sin it was, in its practical workings, that differentiated the Gentile from the Jew—that constituted the badge of Gentileism; and this sin, therefore, it was, that Paul must have had chiefly in mind when contrasting the guiltiness of Jew and Gentile in this Epistle.

This position will appear evident if we read the particular passage under consideration in its connection with what follows. It will be thus seen what the Apostle had in view as the vital core of those revolting vices inventoried in the 26th—32d verses: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven

against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold (down, suppress,) the truth in unrighteousness. Because that which may be known (rather, is known, the knowledge) of God is manifest in them, for God shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse; because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore, God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever."

This passage is one connected whole, from which no single member is to be selected, and isolated, and interpreted as teaching some truth foreign to the drift of the whole, as, for example, the doctrine of final causes, which some have found in vs. 19, 20; or the origin of the idea of God, which others have found in those same verses. The scope of the paragraph is to set forth the origin, progress, and guiltiness of idolatry, and every separate phrase must be expounded so as to bear an organic relation to this central thought. That this *is* the scope of the passage can scarcely be doubted by any one who reads attentively the whole together. To this thought the Apostle returns again and again. Let us examine some of the expressions given to it.

That idol-worship is the burden of the charge presented in v. 25 need not be argued. "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." They changed the truth of God into a lie, by exchanging the worship of the true God for the adoration of idols, the lying vanities of the heathen. The phraseology of this verse, as meaning precisely this substitution of idolatry

for the worship of Jehovah, is illustrated by Jeremiah, xvi : 19, where we read the confession, "Surely our fathers" (going after the heathen) "have inherited *falsehood* (*ψευδοῦς*), objects of vanity, (*εἰδωλα*)." And it is to be noticed that here, as everywhere else in Scripture, the true worship is always represented as preceding, in the history of heathenism, the false, and being exchanged for it, never the contrary. This verse also, as Alford observes, casts light on the ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων of v. 18, shewing what is there meant by suppressing the truth in unrighteousness, viz, quenching the great truth of the Divine nature and claims in the darkening practices of idolatry.

It is equally plain that vs. 22, 23 are to be taken in a historic sense as referring specially to the origin of idolatrous systems, the corrupting of the primitive worship of the true God into debasing creature worship, which, in turn, reacted upon the character of the worshippers themselves with fearfully demoralizing effect. The Edenic figures of the cherubim, in which were combined the forms of a man, a lion, an eagle, and an ox, and whereby the glory of the incorruptible God was displayed, *they* separated, distorted, and changed into images "made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." These bungling counterfeits all pointed for their original to that wonderful group of figures from the midst of which God manifested forth his glory, and which consequently came to be known as "the Cherubim of Glory," and even as "the Glory of the Lord." For these sacred hieroglyphs that were placed in the Sanctuary at the east of the Garden of Eden, and that betokened the divine Presence, where men might offer spiritual worship to God, the heathen substituted figures "graven by art and man's device," through which at first, and to which afterwards, they paid an idolatrous and abominable service.

There is an equally indisputable, though not quite so obvious, reference to the same corruption of Divine worship in v. 21, where the inexcusableness of the heathen is brought into immediate relation to idolatry in its origin. "So that they are without excuse ; because that when they knew God, they

glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but *became vain*, (ἐμταιώθησαν) in their imaginations." Now the word here translated, "became vain," has a special and technical signification in the Scriptures. *Tà μάταια* is, both in the Old and the New Testament, the *nomen proprium* for the vanity of vanities, the folly of follies, the sin of sins; the sin, the folly, the vanity of Idolatry. The most unreal of all conceivable things in the estimation of the inspired writers, were the Gentile idols, hence called "vanities." Accordingly we read in I Kings, xvi: 13, that Baasha and Elah "made Israel to sin in provoking the Lord God of Israel to anger with their vanities" (idols, τοῖς ματαίοις αὐτῶν, Sept.). So in II Kings, xvii: 15, "And they rejected his statutes and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them. And they followed vanity (idols τῶν ματαίων), and became vain (idolatrous, καὶ ἐμταιώθησαν, the precise words of the Apostle in Romans), and went after the heathen that were round about them." Jer., ii: 5, "Thus saith the Lord, what iniquity have your fathers found in me that they have gone far from me, and have walked after vanity (ἐπορεύθησαν ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων), and are become vain (καὶ ἐμταιώθησαν, are become idolatrous, the words again of the Apostle). So also in Jer., viii: 19, "Why have they provoked me to anger with their graven images, and with strange vanities?" (ματαίοις ἀλλοτρίοις, foreign, Gentile idols.)

The New Testament borrows and adopts this language, by which the old idolatries are characterized and rebuked. Thus, when the heathen inhabitants of Lycaonia were on the point of making worshipful sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, the latter protested with expressions of horror, saying, "Sirs, we also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities (idols, ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων) unto the living God—Acts, xiv: 15. In I Cor., viii: 4, the Apostle, with reference to a similar declaration in Isaiah xli: 24, against the vanity and nothingness of idolatry, says, "As concerning, therefore, the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is NOTHING in the world." Hence also he writes, in Gal. xiv: 8,

"Howbeit, then when ye knew not God, ye did service to the Gods which by nature ARE NOT," the rendering of the most authoritative text, τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσαν θεοῖς.

Such was the system to which, without doubt, the Apostle had reference when, in the passage under review, he wrote that the sin, the great original sin, of the Gentile world consisted in their becoming *vain* in their imaginations. It was their idolatrous worship which he thus characterized and reprehended, that primal wickedness of creaturely worship, from which all other Gentile sins and abominations were outgrowths.

We are now prepared to make more definite answer to the question propounded at the commencement of this article, viz: What is the connection of the passage before us with the general argument of the Epistle to the Romans?

Our answer is: The passage was intended to signify the moral guiltiness of the idolatries of the heathen world *on the ground particularly of their origin*. Those idolatries were a deterioration of the true religion, a corruption of the primitive worship, the result of a darkening and perverting of the facts of the original revelation that God had made to the family of man. The Apostle had in mind the advantages with which the nations started in their historical career, and his judgment of condemnation was pronounced from that point of view. The passage, Rom. i: 18-20, takes us back to the time when the great fundamental articles of revealed religion were the common possession of mankind, and it tells us that from that point the so-called heathen *departed* from God, became "*forgettors of God*" (Ps. ix: 17), lapsed into idolatry and all its concomitant vices, and so brought on themselves the divine condemnation and retribution. As bearing on this point, and as being in accordance with our own general view, we here quote a passage from Kurtz's History of the Old Covenant, vol. 2, p. 118, translation: "HEATHANISM is the *prodigal son* whom, because he will no longer remain in his father's house, and under his special superintendence, care, and instruction, the father allows to depart into the world, well knowing that when at last he shall have wasted all his goods and would fain fill his belly with the husks which the swine eat, both present

wants and past experience will make him willing, gladly and thankfully to occupy the place which had been kept open for him. *The relics of his original state, of primeval times and of primeval religion, these are the portion of goods which the son takes with him, and which he wastes in the riotous worship of nature.*"

We will now examine some of the particular expressions of the passage before us that give evidence of this general historical reference, and especially the reference to heathenism in its very origin.

The first condemnatory statement that the Apostle makes concerning the Gentiles is, that they are "*suppressors of the truth,*" for such indisputably is the meaning of the phrase *ἀνδρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων*, "men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness." And this single statement will enable the reader to see the Apostle's drift. It is a clue to the interpretation of all that follows. The inspired penman does not charge the heathens with guilt because they had not, by their own unassisted effort, arrived at and clarified the idea of God, and on that basis built up a correct system of moral and religious truths and honored it by lives of practical virtuousness. But his accusation against them is, that having been originally put in possession of the truth as the direct gift of God, they had, by their unrighteousness, suppressed and crushed it out. It need not be argued that by *the* truth of this passage we are to understand principally the truth of *the Divine Being and attributes*, the truth concerning which the Apostle elsewhere says, "He that cometh to God must believe that *he is*." It was *this* truth especially that the Gentiles are represented as having suppressed when, as Chrysostom says on this text, "*They gave to idols the glory due to God!*" And we must here insist on taking the Apostle's statement of the great original and most fruitful sin of Gentileism just as he has put it. There is, in his language, nothing concerning "germs of religious and moral verity" which men are blamed for not having developed into virtuous growths, nothing concerning human faculties capable of *deriving* the idea of God from a contemplation of nature, nothing concern-

ing “a religious sense or reason by which the divine attributes are apprehended in their own nature;” no such statement of capacity and responsibility on the part of men, and hence of their guilty ignorance. There is here simply the declaration that a portion of mankind had suppressed the truth with which they had once been entrusted; that whereas they started off in “the dispersion” with the knowledge of God, they became “forgetters of God,” and corrupters of his worship.

The 19th verse explains more fully *why* the wrath of God is revealed against the Gentile suppressors of the truth, viz: “because the knowledge of God, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, that which is known of God, the objective knowledge of God, is manifest amongst them (is manifestly amongst them), for God made it manifest to them, *i. e.* from the first, from the time when man was first made an inhabitant of the earth. The meaning of the historic aōrist is to be strictly maintained in interpreting ἐφνέρωσε. God did not leave man in ignorance of himself after he had created him, did not place him here in a state of religious childhood to guess and spell his way up to something like a clear and adequate notion of the Divine Nature, but he gave him the inestimable advantage of starting with a knowledge of God as the creator and governor of the world, as “the father of the spirits of all flesh,” and as the proper object of supreme reverence, love and trust. These and various associated truths, communicated to man by adequate instruction, were *the religious capital* with which the divisions of mankind started in their course of history, both before and after the deluge. And it is absolutely surprising that a contrary theory of the origin of religious notions amongst different nations can have obtained amongst intelligent and believing readers of the Bible. Olshausen, speaking of this theory, “that the course of human development begins with the completest rudeness, and proceeds to the gradual perfection of our inward as well as outward life,” calls it a “quite unscriptural and altogether untenable view,” and adds, “the doctrine of the Apostle is founded on the opposite view of a gradual sinking out of a nobler state into sin.” The language of this verse points to this original and nobler state.

Then follows the important declaration in the 20th verse, in which is given, as we think, not a statement of the means by which men were made responsible for arriving at the knowledge of religious truth, but rather a statement of the fact that there is enough in the visible creation, when duly considered, to corroborate the more direct testimony of a primitive revelation. This verse is not to be connected with the 19th, as shewing God's method of revealing himself by creation alone to the heathen, and their consequent obligation to know and serve him. Were it so, the historic aōrist would not be used throughout the preceding and following verses; for, *that* method is always and everywhere the same, and consequently the Apostle would have written *God is manifesting* to the heathens the knowledge of himself, &c. But the historic tenses continually carry us back to a remote period in Gentile history, and the statement of the 20th verse comes in as a justification of the wrath of God against the Gentile races for having suppressed the truth. That truth originally manifested to them (v. 19) by means of a direct, clear, and full communication from God, and occasionally for a long time afterwards renewed and replenished by such communication, was ever corroborated and illustrated by the works of God's hands, the witnesses of the divine power, wisdom, and goodness. That truth thus originally communicated to man, thus renewed in the history of revelation, and thus illustrated by the order and beauty of the universe, the heathen ought never to have lost, and for their loss of it, and for all the consequent evils, they are morally responsible. We would paraphrase the Apostle's thought in these three verses as follows: "The Gentiles are without excuse in their present degradation. For they evidently have or might have the knowledge of God, and of all essential religious truth amongst themselves, for God once revealed himself to them. And the revelation then made ought to have been in good measure preserved, for ever since the creation of the world, the invisible attributes of God, when we consider them (*νοούμενα*, being considered), are perceived in the things made." For the justification of this rendering of *νοούμενα*, we refer the reader to the use of the

term in II Tim. ii: 7, and Mark viii: 17, in both which passages the idea of "considering" is distinguished from that of "understanding." In Matth. xv: 17 and elsewhere, the word is chosen to indicate an attentive observing and marking. To one well considering the matter, considering the invisible things of God under the advantage of a direct revelation, "the heavens declare (rehearse) the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." In the light of that "Law of the Lord," which the writer of the 19th Psalm enjoyed, and "which is perfect converting the soul," that "testimony of the Lord" which is "sure making wise the simple," "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge." These phenomena of nature are not sufficient to *reveal* God to the human mind. Left absolutely to himself, to the efforts of his own reason without any Divine instruction, man would never rise "through nature up to nature's God." But let God only make himself known to man as the one maker of heaven and earth, and then will the regular alternations of day and night, giving to man the periods of toil and rest; the grateful vicissitudes of the seasons, leading the succession of seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter; the sun, going forth in his daily circuit from one end of heaven to the other, ministering to all things light and warmth; the moon and the stars in their nightly and orderly procession through the skies, be so many witnesses speaking to the soul of man of the wisdom, power and beneficence of the Creator.

The result we have thus reached may be further substantiated by arguments drawn from several other courses of investigation. And the whole subject may be applied to the answering of some important and interesting inquiries that have been raised by religious writers.

These further proofs of our main position, and the application of the subject in the direction indicated, must be reserved for a future article.

ARTICLE VII.—EARLY BAPTIST HISTORY.

1.—*Historical Vindications: A Discourse on the Province and Uses of Baptist History. With Appendixes containing Historical Notes and Confessions of Faith.* By SEWALL S. CUTTING, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

2.—*A Memoir of the Life and Times of the Rev. Isaac Backus.* By Alvah Hovey, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

WE welcome with no ordinary pleasure the addition of the above-named works to our denominational literature. Though small in bulk, they are large in interest and instruction, and give excellent augury of the usefulness of the Backus Historical Society, under whose auspices they are published. The work of Dr. Hovey has been for some time before the public, and the verdict upon its merits has been unanimously favorable. While of necessity lacking somewhat in the minute details and nicer delineations of character which lend to biography its peculiar charm, it is fraught with elements of a far higher than merely personal interest, and is a most important contribution to the history of the progress of religious freedom and of Baptist principles in New England. To those Baptists who would know what our fathers underwent in the assertion of their principles; by what protracted conflicts and martyr-like sufferings they rent in sunder the bonds which held the Church in unnatural and stifling embrace with the State; from what a baptism of fire and blood they caused those sacred rights of conscience to emerge which have become the precious and priceless heritage of every citizen of our Republic, we commend the careful perusal of this admirable volume. It should be read with even deeper thoughtfulness by our Pedobaptist brethren, and should aid them in estimating the value of the "peculiar institution" to

whose maintenance they are willing to sacrifice the simplicity of their Protestant faith and the consistency of their testimony, and whose abrogation would be the signal for the immediate grounding of arms by large sects of our Protestant Christendom. We envy not the heart that can rise from the perusal of this record without a glow of honest indignation at the spirit of proscription which, to maintain its ascendancy, could trample on the dearest rights of man, or without a thrill of grateful admiration for the brave and faithful men who were the victims of this proscription ; who in evil times bore unflinching testimony to the truth ; who confronted spiritual wickedness in the high places of worldly power ; and submitted to the spoiling of their goods, to scourgings, to imprisonment, to numberless and nameless forms of persecution, that they might wring from tardy and reluctant hands the sacred charter of our spiritual freedom.

The work of Dr. Cutting differs widely in character from that of Dr. Hovey, and if less interesting to the superficial, will be not a whit less so to the thoughtful reader. It consists of an Address delivered at the Anniversary of the Backus Historical Society, and repeated before the American Baptist Historical Society at its late Anniversary, on "The Province and Uses of Baptist History," followed, according to the approved usage of the learned of our times, by Appendixes extending to two or three times the length of the discourse under whose courteous shelter they find admission into the volume. No one, however, but would have regretted that a desire to adjust more exactly the proportions of his book, should have led the author to curtail a single line of these appended documents. There is none which we would willingly spare. There is none that does not illustrate some important topic of our denominational history. The discourse itself gives a succinct but exceedingly comprehensive and skilful outline of the preparatory and early stages of our history, — including a learned and successful vindication of the Anabaptist name from much of the odium under which it has rested — and a sketch of the leading benefits which the study of that history is calculated to impart. The first Appendix discusses successively the fol-

lowing topics : the alleged self-baptism of Rev. John Smyth, English pastor in Amsterdam ; the historical baptism of the English people, demonstrating the fact that from the introduction of Christianity down to the Epoch of the Reformation, the Anglican Church recognized no other Baptism than immersion ; creed-statements in the Baptist denomination, showing that, while appealing to the Scriptures as the only proper standard, the Baptists have had a doctrinal unity, and been in the habit of condensing the leading doctrines of Scripture into the form of declarative confessions ; and finally, the origin of the term " Baptist " as a denominational name. The second Appendix gives at length the leading confessions of the Baptist churches in England and America, some of which have become very rare and difficult of access for ordinary readers. These confessions will show at a glance how near the Baptists have kept to the doctrines accepted as orthodox in our evangelical churches.

This brief summary of its contents will give the reader but a very imperfect idea of the value of Dr. Cutting's book, and of its claim to a permanent place in our denominational literature. We cannot be mistaken in believing that it will receive such a place. We know of no book of the same bulk which answers so many questions which an intelligent Baptist would be glad to ask. It is in all its parts the fruit of extended reading and investigation, carried on for years. The style of the discourse is marked by its author's characteristic clearness and elegance, and both it and the work of Dr. Hovey are in the most admirable temper, free from the slightest tinge of acrimony and bitterness. Both should have a place in the library of every intelligent Baptist. Having thus noticed the general character of the two books, we propose to devote a few pages to a discussion of some of their leading topics, in the hope that we may induce our readers to repair to the works themselves, and to others of like character, for fuller information. We shall mainly follow Dr. Cutting's work, as embracing a wider range of topics, but shall not hesitate to draw from both whatever may be germane to our purpose. One of the first topics which Dr. Cutting's work considers,

and which will naturally engage the attention of Baptists, is the paternity of our denomination. Who were our spiritual fathers? What is our pedigree? Granting that our doctrines run back to the age of the Apostles, and that there have never been wanting those who have contended with more or less of purity for our distinctive principles, yet to decide precisely how far back we can trace our distinctive and proper organization, is unquestionably a difficult problem. That Baptist churches, distinctively and strictly such, with *all* our principles of church organization, of church independence, of religious liberty, of the mode and subjects of baptism, are not to be referred to a period anterior to the Reformation, is the opinion of Dr. Cutting, and we incline to think a just one. We believe, however, that the Baptist spirit has never, since the time of the Apostles, been entirely extinct, and that every age has witnessed some who have lived and died in the assertion of essential Baptist principles. The valleys of Piedmont and Savoy must certainly have sheltered many who were Baptist in all but the name. Multitudes of faithful Waldensian confessor scattered over the Netherlands, rejecting infant baptism, greeted with joy the rise of Luther and the dawn of the Reformation. Wicliffe, to whom we owe the first English Bible, and among the most eminent of the "Reformers before the Reformation," was, by probable contemporary evidence, essentially a Baptist. And of the Wicliffites and Lollards who thronged the kingdom during the stormy interval between Richard the Second and Henry the Eighth, we doubt not that the records of the final day will disclose the names of multitudes who carried to the dungeon and the stake their testimony to essential Baptist principles.

In the scantiness of contemporary information our statements here are of necessity somewhat conjectural. Thus much however is certain, and it is well put by Dr. Cutting, that during the dreary and turbulent century and a half that stretches from the death of Wicliffe to the dawn of the Reformation, the English people must have been gradually rising in intelligence, and in preparedness to welcome the breath of spiritual life that was wafted to them from the Continent. The Bible which Wicliffe

had given them was working widely and surely its effects, in deepening the intellectual and religious life of the nation. The wars of the Roses desolated the surface of society, but nobler conflicts of opinion were going on within its bosom; and even those fierce civil strifes, the seeming ministers of anarchy, were breaking the power of the feudal lords, and elevating the English peasantry into the dignity of a people. Had every historical record of this period perished, the progress itself could be inferred with certainty from the augmented power of the language as it opens upon us in the translation of Tyndale, and the literature of the Reformation. A stream will not rise above its fountain. The trumpet can give forth no "certain sound" whose significance is not imparted by the spirit of the trumpeter. And so language, the trumpet of the soul, the organ of its manifold utterances, acquires all its depth, and power, and richness, from the mind that creates and inspires it. The enlarged capacities of the English tongue, therefore, at the period of the Reformation, show the enlarged capacities of the English people. Its rich religious vocabulary proves a corresponding wealth of popular religious ideas. And so it is an interesting fact that while in England the ostensible revolution was an outward and political one, the real revolution was inward and spiritual; that while kingly pride and priestly ambition were dissolving the external bond that linked England to the Papacy, the spiritual one had been already severed by the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God; that the royal mandate but lifted from the necks of the people the yoke of moral thralldom which the emancipating power of truth had already lifted from their souls; and that thus, while upon the surface kings and cardinals were playing at reform, the divine *work* of reform was going on in those depths of the popular heart which their plummet had never sounded. It is often said that while the Reformation on the Continent was essentially popular and religious, the Reformation in England was essentially governmental and political. We concur with Dr. Cutting in believing such an opinion entirely superficial and erroneous. Henry but cut the withes which the rapidly growing giant would soon have

irresistibly snapt assunder. He but struck a pick-axe into the bank for the tide whose swelling flood would soon have refused to be longer constrained. His turbulent and blind phrenzy furnishes one of the most striking comments on the wisdom of that overruling Providence, which makes alike the wrath and lust of man the unconscious ministers of its will. Or rather perhaps — for we scarcely do justice to those divining instincts and that comprehension of their people and their times which lifted the haughty majesty of the Tudors heaven-high above the blear-eyed, blundering obstinacy of the Stuarts — Henry, sensualist and despot as he was, laid a half-conscious ear to the popular heart, caught its deep and deepening throb of opinion, and inaugurated the policy which has been at once the wisdom and the safety of English royalty, of yielding gracefully to inevitable necessities.

But as we reach the period of the Reformation, we are met by a people widely spread in Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, called Anabaptists. It is upon these people that the Baptists are ordinarily affiliated. Prof. Cutting accepts the traditionary genealogy, and then proceeds to wipe away the stain which such a descent is commonly conceived to affix to our denominational escutcheon. That his effort is successful can be doubted by no candid mind that listens to the evidence. He has adduced a series of testimonies, to whose competence and impartiality it is impossible to take exception, in proof that, while there was indeed a class of turbulent fanatics who went under the name of Anabaptists, who both in their creed and their conduct carried liberty to licentiousness, there was another and much larger class, involved in the odium of their name, yet of irreproachable character, and whose only crime was that of consistent fidelity to the great doctrine of justification by personal faith which was blazoned upon the banner of the leaders of the Reformation.

We cannot enter at length into this discussion. But we deem it proper to say a few words by way of forestalling prejudice, and securing to the argument a favorable hearing. Anabaptist phrenzy and fanaticism is with multitudes a “fore

gone conclusion." The "*jam satis constat*" of the Roman historian applies to it in its full force. They are a sect everywhere spoken against,—whose name is unanimously cast out as evil. Their case has been decided in the high court of history, and any attempt to reargue it and reverse the decision is received with the incredulous smile bestowed on the defence of a manifest paradox.

We have a few words to say in reply to this. We need scarcely remind our readers that the sifting of historical traditions is a characteristic of our times; that many a venerable error which had past unchallenged down the centuries, has been arraigned at our critical tribunals, compelled to render an account of itself, and quitted the court discredited, or shorn of half its honors; while many a truth that had lain utterly unsuspected, or like the Seraph Abdiel past "long way through hostile scorn," has at length found due recognition, and been invested with its rightful honors. Innumerable points of Greek and Roman history would illustrate this remark. The Legendary history of Greece and Rome had been accepted by erudite scholars with unsuspecting confidence, until the searching criticism of men like Niebuhr, Müller, and Grote dissolved the mythical enchantment, and remanded the airy usurpers of the domain of history back to the realm of fable. The history of Athens, written always in the interests of despotism, assumed that its government was a turbulent ochlocracy in which any display of wisdom, virtue, or patriotism was a mere fortunate blunder. It has been reserved for the more kindly instincts, and the juster stand-point, as well as the profound erudition, of more recent history, to vindicate Athens from these aspersions, and to show that, with all their faults, her democratic institutions were compatible with a policy energetic, enlightened, and humane. The Sophists of the age of Socrates had been given over to unanimous execration, as the vilest wretches that ever traded in virtue, and debauched the morals of a people. Mr. Grote has put in a powerful plea in their behalf; and even those who doubt the entire validity of his defence, must yet concede that a large abatement must be made from the traditional obloquy that has been heaped

upon them. We might cite more recent examples. We might remind our readers what a different version of the causes of the French Revolution is given to us in the imaginative rhetoric of Burke, and the sober analysis of De Tocqueville; in how different a guise Oliver Cromwell emerges from under the hand of the Tory Churchman, and the hand of the dissenting Whig; and finally, how the entire character of the Puritans, cleared from the mists of prejudice, is shining out with an intellectual and moral grandeur utterly undreamed of by those who derived their impressions from the heartless literature of the Restoration.

The principle applies, in its fullest force, to the case before us. The doctrines of the Anabaptists were such as to raise a universal prejudice against them. It will be seen at a glance that in an age like that of the Reformation, when the fountains of the great deep in human character were broken up, and its elements thrown into the most tumultuous agitation,—an age of crimination and recrimination—an age of violent passions, and fierce and bitter invectives indulged in even by men eminent for Godliness,—that in such an age those who differed from *all* the Reformers on points so vital as spiritual liberty and the nature of baptism, would be little likely to meet with favor or even justice at their hands; and if they could be sent down, involved in the common category of a hated name, to the execration of posterity, the piety of that age was not too scrupulous to resist the temptation. And precisely such was the fact. The men who denied the right of the State to coërcé the conscience, and the Scriptural authority of infant baptism, found friends and advocates no where. The hand of their Ishmaelitish doctrine was against all the sects of the Reformation, and it is no marvel that all these sects paused occasionally from their intestine quarrels to anathematize the common foe. And it should be remembered that there were no terms of abuse and obloquy, no charges of “damnable heresy,” heaped upon the Anabaptists, which the hostile sects did not mutually lavish upon each other. Papists denounced Episcopalians; Papists and Episcopalians denounced Presbyterians; and Presbyterians, Episcopalians

and Papists—Rome, Oxford, and Geneva—launched their united maledictions upon the unsheltered heads of the Anabaptists. Their very name was a watchword of reproach—a badge of infamy; Anabaptists—rebaptizers—a set of fanatical and ignorant come-outers, who insolently and wickedly erected their personal judgments against the collective sentiment and practice of the Church. For men like these no terms of reprobation could be too severe, no persecution too unrelenting, no companionship too bad. Hence when they coupled the peaceful Anabaptists of Switzerland and the Netherlands, pious, exemplary and some of them learned, with the fierce Suabian peasants, who, goaded by feudal oppression, took the law into their own hands, and applied to their civil rights the principle which Luther had asserted for their spiritual, or with the authors of the still more desperate and deplorable phrenzies of Münster, they scarcely deemed that they did them injustice. Yet injustice more flagrant could scarcely be perpetrated. The truth is, those fierce outbreaks against the established order of things, those mad riotings of turbulent fanaticism, were the excesses of delirious passion, the foam and scum of passion which always follow in the wake of great social and moral revolutions. They were utterly without significance except as transient and exceptional forms of that great moral and mental upheaval which was going forward among the nations. They belonged exclusively to no class or sect. The leaders of the Suabian insurrection were Lutherans, and the oppressed of every name flocked to their standards. The fanatics of Münster did not practice immersion; and the mere fact that they asserted and abused some particular tenet of the Baptist faith, does not furnish the slightest ground for fastening them upon a sect with whose general character and doctrines they had nothing in common, and which has been behind none in pronouncing their condemnation.

But meantime wholly independent of these delirious rioters, were large numbers of persons who, quietly but earnestly, were carrying out the principle of the Reformation to its legitimate issues, and who discarded the principle of heredi-

tary faith, and the rite of infant baptism. This assuredly was no unnatural result of Luther's movement. That it was not is proved by the fact that Luther himself asserted against the Vaudois the doctrine that faith should be inseparable from baptism (quoting as authority the passage "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"), and that Melancthon, Zwingli, and Œcolampadius all struggled with doubts upon the point, although they found means to shake them off. But the man who has conjured up a ghost must not be surprised if the uncourteous spirit will not "down at his bidding." While Luther himself stopped half way, it was natural that many of his disciples should push out his doctrines to their logical conclusions. Among these were men to whom the Baptists stand in legitimate affiliation,—men learned, pious, moderate, sound in doctrine and irreproachable in life, who bore the stigma of the Anabaptist name because they advocated a return to the purity of the New Testament ordinances.

"It was such men," says Prof. Cutting, "with whom the Anabaptists had their origin at Zurich. Mantz and Grebel, Hetzer and Hubmeyer were all able and learned men. Mantz, in opposition to Zwingli's indiscriminate church constitution, allied to the State, and upheld and promoted by its power, demanded a church composed of spiritual persons only, introduced into it by a voluntary baptism. He was reproached in reply as 'wishing a church free from sin,' and his followers as exalting themselves in point of holiness above their neighbors. He denied the right of the magistrates to interfere in matters of religion, and this was stigmatized as contempt of the civil authority. His career was short. The magistrates issued their edicts against the Anabaptists, and persecution was commenced. Nevertheless 'in fields and in woods, as occasion offered, with the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures in his hand, he expounded the Word of God to the people who flocked to hear him.' Seized and imprisoned, tried and condemned, he died as became a Christian martyr. His death was by drowning. Zwingli, his old friend, the companion of his earlier studies, who, in the sacred relations of friend and fellow-student, had known his doubts on baptism, and had himself felt their force,

is reported by Brandt to have pronounced his sentence in the few words scarcely less impious than unfeeling, '*Qui iterum mergit, mergatur.*'* Erasmus, startled by these transactions in Zurich, in a letter to his friends in East Friesland, exhorting them to abide in the Ark, paid incidentally his tribute to the character of the sufferers: 'A people,' said he, 'against whom there is very little to be said, and concerning whom we are assured there are many who have been reformed from the worst to the best lives; and though perhaps they may foolishly err in certain opinions, yet have they never stormed towns nor churches, nor entered into any combinations against the authority of the magistrate, nor driven anybody from his government or estate.'"

Of the German Anabaptists many found their way into England in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and their doctrines were widely propagated under the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. The way was thus being prepared for our Baptist fathers, though as yet they probably organized no distinct churches. These stand in still closer connexion with the Anabaptists of Holland, a people whom history traces back, before Luther, to the Waldenses, though undoubtedly the Reformation recruited their numbers and gave an impulse to their cause. This people were numerous and widely spread, verging in creed toward Arminianism, not uniform probably in practicing immersion, but steadfastly holding to believers' baptism, and denying the right of the State to interfere with individual

* The impious application of the doctrine of retribution, involved in this utterance of Zwingle, reminds us, as we recall his own premature and violent death, of an apophthegm of deeper significance, from a higher source: "They that take the sword, shall perish by the sword." We can scarcely refrain also from recalling here another striking instance of what may almost seem retributive martyrdom. When the unhappy Joan of Kent, a woman of eminent standing, was called to expiate her Baptist heresy in the flames, John Rogers was earnestly entreated to exert his influence with the Archbishop in rescuing her from so terrible a doom. Rogers replied that burning alive was no cruel death, but easy enough. The astonished intercessor answered: "Well, perhaps it may so happen that you yourselves shall have your hands full of this same mild burning." The rebuke was prophetic. The martyrdom of Rogers inaugurated the bloody tragedy enacted by the ruthless bigotry of Mary, and around his stake were rekindled the smouldering fires of Smithfield.

conscience. Peaceful, industrious, orderly, conscientiously opposed to bearing arms, William of Orange, when desired to persecute them, bore emphatic testimony to their virtues. Holland is doubly interesting as the region where our denominational fathers came into contact with the Pilgrim Fathers of New-England. A company of Puritans who had left England for an asylum in Holland, meeting here with flourishing Anabaptist churches, were led to adopt their doctrines of church polity, and of the relations of the Church to the State. Thus English Baptist churches were organized here; the one at Amsterdam was under the care of Rev. John Smyth. Another company of Puritans left England a little later, also for a temporary asylum in Holland; these were the future founders of New-England. The meeting of these two bodies on this foreign shore — of the Puritans who had become Baptists, and of the Puritans who adhered to their English principles — is one of the most interesting and instructive scenes in history. Both parties were exiles; both smarting under the rod of persecution, and driven from their country by fidelity to their solemn convictions. The Baptist church in Amsterdam declared in their confession of faith, "that the magistrate is not to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the king and lawgiver of the church and conscience." To this declaration John Robinson, the Pilgrim pastor, replied, advocating the power of the magistrate "to punish civilly religious actions," "he being the preserver of both tables, and so to punish all breaches of both." He is "by compulsion to repress public and notable idolatry, as also to provide that the truth of God in his ordinances be taught and published, and by some penalty to provoke his subjects universally unto hearing for their instruction and conversion; yea, to inflict the same upon them, if after due teaching they offer not themselves to the church."

Thus met face to face, on this neutral ground, the Puritan and the Baptist doctrine — the principles which, in a home then undreamed of by them both, were ere long to come into still sterner conflict. The Baptist raised the banner inscribed

with the motto of soul-liberty ; the Pilgrim leader answered back with an equally emphatic avowal of the right of the state to coërcé the conscience. Both parties consisted of Englishmen, of men of iron nerve and inflexible purpose, ready to carry their convictions to the dungeon, the scaffold, or the wilderness. Both evinced their faith by their works, and gave unquestionable proof of their sincerity and their courage. Both quitted their place of sojourn, but for different purposes and destinations. The reflux tide of Baptist emigration set back to the parent shore, and was reabsorbed into its native fountain ; that of the Pilgrims rolled onward, and became a well-spring of perennial bloom and beauty in the heart of the western wilderness. The Baptists under Mr. Helwisse, Mr. Smyth's successor, deeming it not right to enjoy their asylum while their brethren were oppressed and persecuted at home, returned to England to share their lot, and "to challenge king and state to their faces, and not to yield to them, no, not one foot." The Pilgrims, finding no room in Holland for adequate expansion, girded themselves for a more arduous journey, and a more distant exile, and traversing a boisterous ocean, came, amidst wintry storms, to found a new polity on the "stern and rock-bound coast," and amidst the savage wilds of New-England. Never throbbed there a set of braver, truer hearts than beat in the bosoms of the little company that thronged the deck of the *Mayflower*. Never did a nobler band lead the forlorn hope of a gallant and desperate enterprise. History presents no more touching and impressive spectacle than of that little company bidding adieu to their brethren at Delft-Haven; kneeling on the shore while their venerable pastor commended them to the protection of heaven ; and then, with aching heart but unquailing spirit, setting off in their frail bark, to bear over the waste of waters the germs of the old world's civilization to the virgin soil and expectant solitudes of the new. We sympathize with the agonies, we anticipate the perils, we feel the sublimity of that momentous departure. We would not "abate the tithe of a hair from their just fame." They were stalwart men and women, heroes of history, who planted, amidst peril and privation, in prayers, and tears, and

blood, the tree whose branches now overshadow a continent, and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. And they have had their reward. The unlooked for and grand results of their enterprise have lifted their names into universal renown.

But shall we exhaust on them our sympathy and admiration? When we have followed with swelling hearts the wanderers of the Mayflower to their distant home, to which their triple "welcome" was the roar of "the rocking pines of the forest," the blasts of an almost Arctic winter, and the yell of the savage, shall we turn with less of interest to the little band that, still earlier than they, went back to assert the principles, and share the persecutions of their brethren? If less imposing in its outward aspect, if less magnificent in its apparent results, did their act breathe less of the martyr-spirit, and less deserve to be enshrined in the grateful affection and reverence of the world? True, they did not brave the perils of an ocean voyage, and the terrors of a howling wilderness; but they breasted the stormier billows of popular prejudice and hate, and trod those wilds of human passion for which nature in her most frightful aspects has no parallel. They did not encounter the fury of the wild beast, and the tomahawk of the savage; but they confronted the deadlier ferocity of religious bigotry, clothed with the vestments of office, and armed with the authority of Star Chambers and Courts of High Commission. They did not eat the bitter bread of foreign exile; but they ate the still bitterer bread of strangers and outcasts on their own soil. They did not sicken and starve in a distant and inhospitable wilderness; but they bled under British scourges, stood, spectacles of shame, in British pillories, and dragged out weary years in British dungeons. They did not, amidst tearful hopes, lay the foundations of a mighty Empire in the New World; but they labored, amidst obloquy and persecution, to redeem the Old from the servitude of ages, and rear there the sublime though invisible empire of spiritual freedom. And to that cause they were faithful in all its varying phases; with the tongue and with the pen, in the dungeon and on the field, they maintained the cause of political and religious liberty. With their brother Puritans

they rallied to the standard of Cromwell, and they lent their psalms and their pikes to the grim ranks of the Ironsides whose resistless shock scattered the Royalists at Marston Moor, and turned to headlong rout the fierce chivalry of Rupert at Naseby. At the restoration they suffered, in common with the Presbyterians and Independents, from the Act of Uniformity. They spurned with contempt the bait held out to them by the Act of Indulgence under James II, and in that critical and memorable time when the cause of Episcopacy became the cause of English liberty, they forgot all their accumulated wrongs, buried all their resentments, and went heart and soul with the Bishops who resisted the encroachments of the Throne.

And in all this period while the mass of the Baptists were undoubtedly uneducated, they yet numbered in their ranks men whose talents and learning, as well as piety, would have adorned any denomination. Their Confession, drawn up in 1643, several years before the Westminster, is a document that could not have proceeded from illiterate men. Thoroughly orthodox and moderate, it drew from their bitterest enemies the acknowledgment that the sect which held such a creed was not liable to the charge of heresy. And no sooner did the accession of William and Mary assure to them protection in their worship, than they met in general convention, and took measures to found an Institution which should give them the benefits of an educated ministry. The English Baptists have received but scanty justice at the hands of history. They have swelled that list of confessors and martyrs to whom the world is slow to render its acknowledgment. But their record is on high, and their time is sure.

 Their blood was shed
In confirmation of the noblest claim,
Our claim to feed upon immortal truth,
To walk with God, to be divinely free,
To soar, and to anticipate the skies.
Yet few remember them. They lived unknown,
Till persecution dragged them into fame,
And chased them up to heaven. Their ashes flew —
No marble tells us whither. With their names
No bard embalms and sanctifies his song,
And history, so warm on meaner themes,
Is cold on this.

We turn to the Pilgrims. They also carried over the sea the doctrines which they had advocated at home. Having never questioned at home the abstract right of state interference, they were prepared to assert it when themselves in power, and to mete out to others the measure which had been meted to them. Their enterprise was in the interest of religion, and of religion as they understood it. They came not to lay the foundations of a free and catholic commonwealth, but to plant institutions which should give shelter and growth to their own religious faith and polity. On this principle they systematically acted. Episcopalians were informed that this was no place for them, and were put forcibly on ship-board and sent home. Quakers were whipped and hanged. Baptists were first exiled, and then, through a long series of years, oppressed and persecuted by the communities that were unable to uproot them.

We are sometimes told that this persecution was merely incidental. Incidental? A policy which was distinctly declared before they left Holland ; which began with their earliest landing on the shores of New England, and was prosecuted with unrelenting rigor for a century and a half! "With a great sum," says Dr. Hovey, "did the fathers of our denomination in New England obtain that religious equality which is our acknowledged birthright. They were driven into the wilderness, were scourged by order of the civil power, were spoiled of their goods, were cast into prison, were pelted by the violence of mobs, were falsely accused, were reviled and defamed and treated as the filth and offscouring of mankind : their principles were caricatured, their purposes maligned, their integrity questioned, their petitions slighted, and their hopes deferred." In 1631, eleven years after the landing of the Pilgrims, the General Court of Massachusetts "ordered and agreed that, for time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." In 1636 it issued a notice to all, that it did not "approve of any such companies of men as shall henceforth join in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first ac-

quaint the magistrates, and the elders of the greater part of the churches in this jurisdiction with their intentions, and have their approbation herein." The same year witnessed the banishment of Roger Williams. In 1644 it was ordered "that if any person within this jurisdiction shall openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation during the administration of this ordinance, after due means of conviction, he shall be sentenced to banishment." In 1648 the Cambridge Platform declared that "It is the duty of the magistrate to take care of matters of religion, and to improve his civil authority for the observing of the duties commanded in the first as well as in the second table. The end of the magistrate's office is not only the quiet and peaceable life of the subject in matters of righteousness and honesty, but also in the matters of Godliness. Idolatry, blasphemy, *heresy*, * * * are to be restrained and punished by the civil authority." In 1651 three Baptists were arrested in Lynn for holding religious worship in a private house, re-baptizing, &c., taken to Boston, cast into prison, fined, and one of them publicly whipped with great severity. In 1656 Quakers were forbidden to enter the Colony under severe penalties: and in 1659, 48 years after the last Baptist was burned in England, two Quakers suffered death for remaining in the Colony after a third banishment. In 1665 a few brethren established a Baptist meeting in Boston. They were fined and imprisoned by the General Court, and only after several years of great suffering began to be recognized as a Christian church. In 1679—but we will not pursue these sickening details. We have not the slightest pleasure in uncovering the nakedness of our fathers. We will merely add that after the "Anabaptist" sectaries became too numerous to be crushed out by direct enactments, they were still fined for the support of the churches of the "standing order," and for refusing to pay such rates were thrown into prison as common malefactors, and their goods often sold for a quarter of their value. This state of things continued essentially unchanged down to the war of the Revolution.

These few statements, selected from many in Dr. Hovey's

book, show abundantly the principle of the New England settlement. Never was a principle more thoroughly incorporated into the constitution of a body politic; never was a principle more systematically and inflexibly carried out. The Pilgrims were not men of accident, veering about with the capricious breath of circumstances; but stern, thoughtful, resolute, they fought inch by inch in defence of the spiritual territory on which they had planted their banner.

That they never originally contemplated persecution is indeed altogether probable, and neither did they contemplate any encroachment of heretical doctrines upon the territory around which they had driven the plow-share of demarcation, and within whose sacred enclosure church and state were to be wrought together into one well-compacted and solid organization. They had winnowed out from their body all the chaff; they planted only the pure wheat; and they did not contemplate the springing up of any tares which would need to be rooted out and burned. They simply miscalculated in this some of the grand principles of human nature. They forgot that the

Cælum, non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt

of the Roman poet was true for all times, for all oceans, and for all the great principles of our nature. They forgot that they brought along with them those elements of thought and investigation, those capacities and habits of questioning established forms, which would be likely to operate as vigorously and prove as troublesome in the New World as they had done in the Old. They forgot that very possibly in the Mayflower itself, very possibly in the first rude cabins which they reared to shield them from the inclement skies of New England, there might be lurking unsuspected elements of rebellion against some of those very principles for which all these hardships and perils were encountered. They forgot, in short, that the very spirit and essence of their enterprise was dissent; and that until the last error was exploded from their creed, until the *Ultima Thule* of religious truth had been reached, they might lay their account with having to encounter the

same stern questionings, denials, and affirmations which had driven their fathers from the Popish, and themselves from the Episcopal communion. Hence the witch-haunted household of their own community, who removed to a distant locality to escape their obnoxious guest, and exclaimed in self-gratulation over their arrival, "Well, we are all here," were not more startled at hearing the well-known shrill tones respond in mocking malignity, "Yes, we are all here," than were the Pilgrims to find that the Demon of dissent whom they supposed that they had exorcised, and left three thousand miles beyond the sea, was already in their midst, working his sorceries in their own homes and their own bosoms. Well had it been, if they had borne in mind and understood the seer-like words of Mr. Robinson amidst the quivering agonies of the solemn parting at Delft-Haven, that he was "verily persuaded that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word."

And we cannot refuse to see that as persecution was a settled element of their policy, so it was the natural outgrowth of their principles. Infant Baptism is in its very idea opposed to individualism. It nips religious liberty in the very bud. It blasts it in the very germ. It extirpates it at the very root. It begins by instituting sponsors for the faith of the child. It anticipates his birth, and by some mysterious process marries on the spiritual life of the child to the spiritual life of his progenitors. It does not leave him the poor privilege of being born in original sin. If, with the pious old lady, he should ever come to the conclusion that if he lost his total depravity, he would lose all his religion, his case would be hopeless. He can neither believe nor disbelieve for himself. When he grows up to moral consciousness and the period of moral responsibility, he finds, by some spiritual legerdemain, by some mysterious law of hereditary transmission, that responsibility shifted to another, and a corresponding disposition of his outward relations. While yet unborn, linked with his believing parent, he was safely enfolded in the bosom of the covenant, and as soon as born has been snugly sheltered in the bosom of the church. In un-

conscious infancy the vows of the church have been laid upon him ; the sacred obligations of the Christian profession assumed in his behalf. He cannot quit the church to which he has been attached in infancy, or remain aloof from it, without a forcible sundering of bands which have been cast around him. He cannot think for himself without being liable to be dealt with for heresy. He cannot act for himself without being liable to be dealt with for contumacy. The church has thrown her arms around him and she claims him as her own. "That children, by baptism," — so runs the Westminster declaration, approved by the General Assembly of Scotland, — "are solemnly received into the bosom of the visible church, distinguished from the world, and them that are without, and united with believers ; and that all who are baptized in the name of Christ do renounce, and by their baptism are bound to fight against the devil, the world, and the flesh ; that they are Christians and federally holy before baptism, and therefore they are baptized ; that the inward grace and virtue of baptism is not tied to that very moment of time wherein it is administered, and that the fruit and power thereof reacheth to the whole course of our life." Ah, could the ordinance but realize these professions made in its behalf ! Could the holy water sprinkled on the brow, and the holy name uttered over it, really prove the talisman which it claims to be against the baleful workings of the great Foe — the enemy more potent and terrible than Death ! But

Alas, Leviathan is not so tamed,

and he mocks at the impotent weapon which recoils from his dragon-scales.

Now that the principle of voluntariness in religion is thus cut up at the root, that for it the principle of coërcion is substituted, is self-evident. The man is bound to the church by obligations laid upon him when he was yet unconscious, and knew neither good nor evil. And the church having begun her work must finish it. Him whom she has brought under her discipline she must subject to her discipline ; and as many may be disposed to break away and ignore the authority thus

assumed over them, she must look around for some means of enforcing her claims. Her natural, her only appeal is to the arm of the civil magistrate, and her first business is therefore to put herself in alliance with the state.

And here another principle comes in to her aid. The doctrine is that the child of the believer is born a Christian, and that because he is a Christian he is baptized and is a genuine member of the church. Assume now that this is no idle parade of words, but a doctrine honestly believed and acted upon. The inevitable consequence follows. Once a Christian always a Christian, is true both for himself and his descendants "to the last syllable of recorded time." Piety and church-membership both become hereditary, and spread themselves by fixed and certain laws through all the ramifications, and to every individual, of the race of the Godly. By necessary consequence, then, individual Christianity is lost in family Christianity, and the religion of the family soon merges into the religion of the State. Why should it not? Church and State become coincident in territory and population. The members of the State are all members of the church, and it may well behoove them to devolve on some one,—and on whom more appropriately than on the Civil Magistrate—the charge of seeing that none are derelict in duty; that no child is allowed, through the remissness of his parents, to lose the benefits of a rite whose consequences are so momentous, nor when grown up, to shake off the yoke of obligation which the watchful benevolence of the church has placed upon his infant neck.

Such, logically, such in fact, was New England Congregationalism. It broke off from a national church which it did not like, to come over the seas and found a national church which it did like. On the soil on which it had set its foot it planted the banner of unlimited dominion. Its parishes were territorial parishes. Its churches were territorial churches. It claimed the fealty of every soul born within its limits. The civil magistrate was but the instrument of the spiritual power, and dissent from the recognized modes of worship was punished as alike disobedience to God, and rebellion against the State.

Just as little is it accidental that Baptists have been the uniform advocates of religious freedom, and that single-handed they have fought the battle against the banded sentiment of christendom. It flows necessarily from their first principle. Their doctrine of individualism—of personal faith and voluntary baptism—draws along with it as with the sweep of a cataract, the absolute repudiation of all State interference between the conscience and its God. The claim of the civil power to coërcé men into religious faith and union with the church, becomes a grand impertinence—only not utterly ridiculous, because audaciously wicked. To his own master each one standeth or falleth. He is in immediate, untransferable, inviolable relations to God, and neither man nor angel can wrest from him the privilege, nor lift from him the obligation of his high spiritual prerogative. By a logical necessity, therefore—by every principle and the whole spirit of his system, every Baptist is committed to the advocacy of religious liberty. And by a necessity equally strong, every *consistent* Pedobaptist is committed against it. Innocent as infant baptism seems—as slight a thing as it appears to lay the consecrating hand on the brow of the unconscious babe, and utter over it the sacred formula, it is in fact a thing of wondrous potency. If it has not precisely the consequences which the confession assigns to it, it has others scarcely less far-reaching, and of less questionable reality. Its tendency is to invite the world into the arms of the church, and then to throttle the church in the embrace of the world. It has thus linked itself with spiritual despotism, and is at this moment in Europe the strong bond of alliance between the church and the State.

Nor can we fail to remark how utterly discordant is the doctrine on which infant baptism rests, with the spirit of Calvinism. An especial characteristic of the system of Calvin is its assertion of original depravity, and of our absolute dependence for moral purity on regenerating grace. How these two doctrines—an absolute heirdom of wrath, and inherited church-membership—can “dwell together in unity” it is impossible to discover. They are irreconcilably hostile. Like two distinct races dwelling together on the same soil, one

must hold its ground at the expense of the other. In New-England's early history the hereditary principle prevailed. Religion therefore rapidly declined from its purity. The church was inundated by the world—by men who had no sympathy with its vital doctrines; to whom the cross was a stumbling-block, and evangelical religion foolishness. Hence the church lay cold and dead in the arms of her baptized enemies, until the Great Revival awoke her slumbering life. Since then, in that portion of the church which did not renounce evangelical doctrines and faith, the Calvinistic element has been in the ascendant, and infant baptism has shrunk into little more than a ceremony, a form of dedication by which the parent seeks to deepen his own sense of responsibility, and secure he knows not what spiritual benefit to his offspring.

We must dispatch briefly the remaining topics of Dr. Cutting's book. The first article in the Appendix vindicates the Rev. Mr. Smyth, the English pastor in Holland, from the charge of having baptized himself. The vindication seems complete, and the charge originated probably in a misinterpretation of the Latin phrase "*se ipsos baptizare*," which might be understood either of their baptizing themselves, or baptizing each other. Reciprocal immersion was mistaken for self-immersion. Our interest, however, in the question is, we confess, mainly historical. It would detract very little from our respect for Mr. Smyth to know that he had baptized himself; and while we might smile at an honest believer, in his zeal for the purity of baptism, pronouncing the sacred formula over his own submersion, we should reserve our deeper emotions for conscious perversions of a Scriptural ordinance.

A very important article in the Appendix is devoted to the historical testimonies regarding the mode of baptism formerly prevalent in Great Britain. No fact is more completely established, than that from the introduction of Christianity into England down to the Reformation, immersion was the almost exclusive baptism of the English Church. The series of testimonies from Bede and Alcuin down, is almost unbroken. We cite a specimen or two from the ample evidence given in Prof. Cutting's book. In 816 a canon was passed at

the Synod of Celichyth to this effect: "Let also priests know that when they administer holy baptism, they pour not holy water on the heads of infants, *but always immerse them in the font.*" A canon of the Council of Cashel under Henry I, — this case is not cited by Dr. Cutting — ordains "that children be brought to the church, and be baptized there with a three-fold immersion." A Council held in London in 1200 passed the following regulation: "If a boy is baptized by a layman, the rites preceding and following the immersion must be performed by a priest."

It was in the reign of Edward VI, that the rigor of the rule requiring immersion was first relaxed. An ordinance was passed allowing, in cases of weakness, affusion to be substituted for immersion. Cases of weakness were, of course, rapidly multiplied. Tender mothers and careful nurses soon found their little ones all too delicate to bear the sterner process of immersion, when affusion was believed to have the same spiritual efficacy.

But what contributed still more to the prevalence of affusion was the influence of the exiles who returned from Geneva at the accession of Elizabeth. Many of the fugitives from the Marian persecution had been attracted to Geneva by the reputation of Calvin. Here was formed a large and flourishing English church, embracing many persons distinguished for piety and intelligence. Here, perhaps under the immediate persuasion and auspices of Calvin, they executed that translation of the Scriptures known as the Genevan Bible, which we have reason to regret was not allowed to be made, instead of the much inferior Bishop's Bible, the basis of our authorized version. Calvin threw the weight of his vast influence in favor of affusion against immersion. While affirming unequivocally and repeatedly, that the meaning of the word and the practice of the early church were on the side of immersion, he yet ventured, on what satisfactory ground it is difficult to see, to assert the right of the church to vary from it at its convenience and discretion.* It is painful to reflect that

*We give the precise language of the great Genevan Reformer. The coolness with which a man of such eminent piety sets aside the express command of the

the Reformers brought with them from this seat of sacred learning and influence, along with the noble Theology of Calvin, and the translation which they had executed under his auspices, his authority for corrupting still further the rite of baptism, and for recognizing the right of the secular magistrate to control religion—a right asserted in their address to Elizabeth, in which they brought from the Old Testament precedents for royal persecution. “Yea,” say they, “and in the days of King Asa it was enacted that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel, should be slain, whether he were small or great, man or woman.” The suggestion was intended for the benefit of the Papists and Anabaptists, but the cup came back to their own lips, and they expiated at a later period their mistaken counsel in bitterness and blood.

Under the joint influence of the causes above named, affusion gained ground steadily in England, and in the temporary prostration of the Episcopacy under Cromwell, consummated its triumph. In the Westminster Assembly immersion was formally excluded from the baptismal ceremony by a majority of one. On such slender threads hang the usages of centuries!

No wonder, then, that immersion has been rather favorably regarded by Episcopalians. Affusion advanced slowly in England until it came in on an overwhelming tide from Geneva. Immersion was strictly inculcated in all the different local systems of church service, and commanded the traditionary veneration of the English Church. Hence when the disciples of Calvin inculcated affusion, the innovation was resisted by

Supreme Legislator of the Church, is one of the most puzzling and painful problems of our enigmatical humanity, “*Ceterum mergaturne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an semel, an infusa tantum aqua aspergatur, minimum refert: sed id pro regionum diversitate ecclesiis liberum esse debet. Quanquam et ipsum baptizandi verbum mergere significat, et mergendi ritum veteri ecclesia observatum fuisse constat.*—(Inst. Lib. IV, Cap. xv. 19.) Our learned readers will pardon our adding a translation: “But whether the subject of baptism be wholly immersed, and that thrice or once, or only sprinkled with water poured upon him, is entirely indifferent; this should be left to the discretion of churches, according to the diversity of climates. Although the word *baptize* itself signifies to immerse, and it is unquestionable that the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient church.”

the conservative divines of the establishment, and only triumphed when the Great Rebellion laid king and church at the feet of the energetic Puritan.

This practice of the English Church through a thousand years—this long continued adherence to immersion—is not a mere empty historical fact. It has a significance all the more striking, as it coëxisted with the partial corruption of the ordinance in the baptism of infants. Infant baptism leads naturally to affusion, and the long-continued resistance to this tendency proves how thoroughly immersion had been rooted in the history and traditions of the church, as well as in the teachings of the Sacred Word.

We pass an interesting article on the origin of "Baptist" as a denominational term, and barely refer to the subject of Baptist symbolism. Perhaps the most important part of Dr. Cutting's book, and that which exhibits the most original research, is his account of the relation of our history, as a people, to creeds and confessions of faith. The facts here developed will doubtless surprise many. The tendencies of our organization are not to centralization, but to diffusion; not to definite and binding forms of doctrinal statement, but to the largest individual liberty which is consistent with an organic unity. This has led to a misconception of our position on this point. We talk so little of Platforms and Confessions, we appeal so constantly, not to the creed, but to the parent of the creed, the Bible, that many, both without and within our pale, have supposed us wholly indifferent to these formal condensed statements of doctrine and discipline. Our history refutes this opinion. We scarcely emerged into visibility as a sect, before we put forth a declaration of our faith, the earliest in the English dissenting annals, and followed later by others still more full and comprehensive. True, these confessions have been declaratory rather than legislative, and thus have not violated the Baptist principle by trenching on the independence of the churches. But they have proved, therefore, none the less effective and potent, and have in fact realized the true idea of a confession, expounding, condensing, classifying the teachings of the Divine Word, and thus aiding to a knowledge of Scrip-

ture, and tending to perpetuate in the church the faith which they originally only declare. The Confessions here given will be perused with deep interest by our readers, and will inspire them at once with a profounder reverence for the truths which are the basis of our organized existence, and with a warmer love for the people who have rallied so unanimously around these grand symbols of the Protestant faith. Our denominational tendency is doubtless to underrate the importance of such symbols. We trust that the publication of these confessions will lead our people to study them afresh, and to remember that the most healthy piety is that which, while it draws daily refreshment from the living springs of Scripture, also keeps itself in vital connexion with whatever is truly excellent in the past. Humanity has a certain organic unity and growth, and we cannot afford, even were it possible, to cut in sunder the bonds which unite us to former ages. There is a certain permanence and stability imparted to that faith which accumulates the successive forces of the ages.

We cannot close our article without expressing the fresh satisfaction with which every review of our history inspires us. We feel no blush of shame mantling our cheeks as we trace the history of our fathers. True, they were not great according to the world's estimate of greatness. They were not noble after any human standard or patent of nobility. Our church did not spring into existence at the mandate of royalty. Our doctrines were not warmed into life by the sunshine of court favor. Our people did not occupy the high places of wordly dignity. They were the outcasts of the outcast. They were the persecuted of the persecuted. They were counted unworthy to dwell with those who were themselves the victims of proscription. But they were among the moral heroes whose characters brighten under the searching light of history; and they have left to their descendants a name which they may be proud to bear, and an example which they should be zealous to emulate.

And the principles which have borne us through the past are, we doubt not, those which are to triumph in the future. The principle of soul-liberty, of man's inalienable lordship of

his own convictions, must be our sheet anchor. Does religious truth shrink from the ordeal of untrammelled inquiry? Will the forces of an advancing civilization—the spirit of a higher philosophy and a purer philanthropy—explode the church as an antiquated institution, and the Bible as the product of a childish and semi-barbarous age? If it be so—if the Bible and the Spirit who inspired it, if the church and the Redeemer who reigns in and over it—if these are not adequate to assure the safety of Christianity, and its advancement on the topmost wave of human progress, no appeal to the secular arm can remedy the matter. If religion cannot be supported without the sword of the civil magistrate, it cannot be supported with it.

But we have no fears. Evil as are many of the portents of the times, the auguries for good incomparably outnumber them. The night is far spent; the shadows are fleeing away, and

Jocund day

Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops.

Never was Christianity so firmly entrenched in the faith and affections of men; never did the Bible sway so many intelligent understandings as now. Never, since the miracles of the Pentecost, did the religion of the cross give ampler assurance of its power to maintain itself against infidelity, against superstition, against worldliness, against the hostility of its open foes, and the treachery of its pretended friends; never, of its power to cast down all that exalteth itself against God, to subjugate the universal heart, and become the power of God unto salvation to the ends of the earth.

ARTICLE VIII.—BOOK NOTICES.

THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

THE CRUCIBLE, BY REV J. A. GOODHUE.* Mr. Goodhue, who, we believe, is comparatively a young man, has written a treatise which is at once original in its method, discriminating in its analysis, pertinent to the times, and grounded in its general principles, in a sound theology. Assuming that regeneration is a work of the Holy Spirit, and that this work may be tested by reliable criteria, he divides religious experiences into three great classes, which he respectively denominates "Unrecognized Regeneration, or faith without hope; Unrecognizable Regeneration, or hope without faith; Recognized Regeneration, or faith and hope." We have not space to follow the author in his minute and careful analysis of these several classes, and can only indicate a few points of our agreement with him, as well as a few of our dissent from him.

In his treatment of unrecognized regeneration, he has done a much needed service in defending children against inappropriate tests. "It is," by far too commonly "felt that when they are converted they ought to become men and women, instead of being Christian children." We could wish, however, he had been more thorough and radical in his treatment of the "evidence" that the truly regenerate can continue in an unrecognized state. The author does not touch the psychological portion of that evidence. But it is questionable, perhaps, whether an attempt to prove either its possibility or reality, is even desirable. The attempt might be dangerous in specific cases, and is unnecessary in any case. It is dangerous, because the vivid impressions and lively emotions of even a spurious conversion may take false coloring in the distant light of memory, and deceive even the most discriminating. If a spurious conversion may deceive one at the very time of its supposed occurrence, how much more easily when every test has disappeared, and the individual is encouraged to believe that, though he has been living in open and conscious rebellion against God, he may yet have been truly regenerated. The attempt, moreover, if not dangerous, is at least unnecessary. It is possible to reproduce the emotional tests of a genuine conversion at any moment the soul can be brought into a

* *The Crucible; or Tests of a Regenerate State, designed to bring to light suppressed hopes, expose false ones, and confirm the true.* By REV. J. A. GOODHUE, A. M. With an introduction by REV. E. N. KIRK, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

believing relation to Christ. And the surest way,—the way most consonant with what the author has elsewhere said of the “false treatment” of spurious regeneration,—is not to disinter a buried hope of the past, but to awaken that sense of sinfulness which shall lead, where every one, at every stage of his progress, alone can find peace, to the cross of Christ. Once *there*, all the emotions of a genuine regeneration are produced, whether he be then first regenerated, or only first made conscious of his hidden hope and life. Nor will it suffice to say that one who is of the unrecognized regenerate cannot thus be brought to exercise faith in Christ. The fact is, the being in such a state is sinful, and the person in it is to be dealt with as a sinner. And even if not so dealt with, he can be taught to do what the genuine Christian repeatedly does, when distressed, perhaps overwhelmed, with a sense of his sinfulness, fly to Christ and be at rest. “As we have received Christ Jesus so walk we in him.”

The author's designation of Part II, as “Unrecognizable Regeneration,” involves an ambiguity, for which the advantages of mere paronomasia are no sufficient compensation. The discussion of “false treatment” of spurious regeneration, in section 2, chapter ii, of this Part, is one of the most thorough and valuable in the book. We wish it could be read by multitudes of our ministers. We have long been satisfied that our great danger in revivals is a superficiality of conviction of sin. There can be no true regeneration without a deep and pungent sense of guilt. But we very much question the propriety of such tests as the author specifies near the close of chapter i, on the “aspects of unrecognizable regeneration.” They would prove the fruitful seeds of uncharitableness. “Judge not that ye be not judged.” We also cannot but regard section 4, under chapter ii, of this Part, on “Satanic Influence,” as unfortunate and unguarded in its statements. The “operations” of the “Evil Spirit,” he tells us, “form a parallel” with those of the Holy Spirit. “The Evil One, like the Holy Spirit, operates upon the mind,” “is thoroughly acquainted,” “loves,” “moulds,” &c., &c. Such language is in danger of being perverted into a show of reason for the charge of Theodore Parker against the orthodox, as making “the Devil an outlying member of the Godhead, unacknowledged, but as much a part of Deity as either Son or Holy Ghost.”

Part III, on Recognized Regeneration, which occupies more than half of the volume, will, doubtless, prove to ordinary Christian readers, its most attractive and congenial portion. The author having considered the “possibility of recognition by the subject of it and by others,” proceeds to lay down the proposition that the “*regenerate character is peculiar and distinct from all other, and by its peculiarities and distinctiveness is to be known.*” The validity of this principle he illustrates at length, making, however, a “distinction between the old man and the new,” which we are not sure that we understand, and which, we suspect, was not entirely clear to the author's own mind. His exposition and defence of the “spiritual consciousness” as the primary source of evidence of regeneration, will, we think, command the unanimous assent of his readers. But there will not be the same unanimity in the estimate put upon his treatment of the “secondary source of evidence,”

the "reasoning process." He here applies certain tests with a decisiveness and dogmatism that are painful. He forgets that the Spirit's modes of procedure are as diversified as are the moral and mental constitutions of men, and these again as endlessly various as the human physiognomy. But we must bring our notice to a close. There are many points in the volume on which we should be glad to dwell, but must wait—not long we hope—till the appearance of a second edition. Meanwhile, in preparing for that edition, it may not be amiss to suggest to the author, that his style of writing, though naturally perspicuous and singularly well fitted to his purpose, and in many respects excellent in itself, may not unprofitably engage his attention. Obscurities and inaccuracies of expression, and looseness of construction, as well as occasional grammatical slips, should all disappear from a work of such ability and merit.

There may be great diversities of opinion respecting the propriety of such introspection and self-dissection, as this treatise will engender. The advocates of salvation by the sacraments and of *ecclesiasticism*, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, have avowed their aversion to "Edwards on the Affections;" they will not conceal their dislike for the "Crucible." And that class of revivalists who, harping on the mercies and promises of God, exhort the inquirer to exert himself and "resolve to become a Christian," will not fail to dissuade men from reading it. To the attention of all these we would most earnestly commend it; not forgetting our Methodist brethren, whose system of "probation" brings so many unconverted people within the pale of their church.

ROBERTSON'S SERMONS.*—These Sermons are obviously very imperfectly reported and not very well edited. The titles to the several Sermons often convey little or no idea of the subject discussed. It is no small testimony to the value of the discourses that, though reported under such grave disadvantages, they yet preserve so much of excellence. So pervaded were they with life, that the very sketches and skeletons are animate and powerful.

"*Mes chansons, ces sont moi*," said Beranger. And in a similar spirit might Robertson have said, "My sermons are myself." They are instinct with his own personality. We seem not to be reading sermons, but to be conversing with the gifted, generous, and chivalrous curate. So entirely do they express the personal life of the author, that we cannot conceive of the sermons being preached by any one else. Many sermons are so *external* to their author's life, that they might be borrowed and preached (and often are) by any man to any people; fitting like a wooden leg, as well to a stranger as to the owner. That which does not spring from the personal life of the speaker, will hardly reach the personal life of the hearer.

Another feature of these discourses is their vivid sympathy with nature. The preacher beholds, understands, and delights in every aspect

* *Sermons Preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton.* By the late REV. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, the Incumbent. 1st, 2d, and 3d Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. *Lectures and Addresses, by the same.*

of the external world. And nature, "who will not be stared at," even by his gentle, reverent admiration, gives him at once her confidence and affection. And right heartily does he repay her in his ardent love of her scenes. A devout student of Wordsworth, the influence of the great poet betrays itself everywhere in his preaching.

Far grander, however, than this characteristic of the Sermons, is the profound and generous *humanity* which they embody. Robertson's mission was to *man*. It was to man that he spoke, and for man that he labored; for man universal, for the servants who composed, in part, his congregation, for the high-born visitors at Brighton; but most of all for the "working men," who loved him so truly and mourned him so sincerely. He burned with indignation at any wrong inflicted on them; he glowed with hopes of a bright future in store for all men; and for the advancement of all, toiled ceaselessly and unweariedly. When others yielded to a temporary discouragement, he never despaired; but labored on in hopefulness for the elevation of the race. And this fervent and generous humanity, as it was a part of himself, so does it find expression in his sermons.

From this love for man sprang his sympathy with man. He addressed himself alike to every class—was on a level with the men of every grade. And hence the sympathy felt toward him on the part of universal man. Not alone among the varied classes of his own congregation was this sympathy to be observed, but it has extended wherever his name and his words have gone. We know not when a volume of sermons has been published that has gained the ear and the heart of so many different shades of religious sentiment. We have heard these Sermons commended by Arian and Orthodox, by Arminian and Calvinist. Spurgeon has, indeed, more numerous auditors and readers, but he does not draw them from so many diverse quarters.

Along with the excellencies which we have suggested, these Sermons are characterized by grave defects. The want of unity is one of their most obvious faults. We do not find in each sermon a discussion of a single topic. Sometimes several topics are introduced; sometimes two are discussed interchangeably; and sometimes thoughts are introduced which, however valuable in themselves, distract the attention.

A graver fault is the inadequate comprehension and statement of the great doctrinal truths of Christianity. We need only refer to the sermon on "God's Revelation of Heaven," and that on "Caiaphas's View of Vicarious Sacrifice," for proof that Robertson's view of the doctrines of Inspiration and the Atonement were altogether unsatisfactory. We do not, indeed, so much impute to him that he was positively wrong, as that, negatively, he was not right. Had he lived longer, very likely his candid, earnest mind, that longed for truth, and that could not be satisfied with superficial answers to the great questions which agitate man, would have found its way, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, into the full light of evangelical theology.

If we do not mistake, both of the defects to which we have alluded are traceable to the inadequate professional education of the Anglican Ministry. They do not learn how to make sermons, and address their fellow men, until they learn from their own experience—often from

their own mistakes. Nor have they solved, under the advice of experienced teachers, the problems of theology, before they are called on to teach others.

But after all, these Sermons are the utterances of a most sincere, noble soul. Whatever his belief, he spoke fully up to it. He spoke not a word beyond it. We prefer one who believes only five degrees and speaks five degrees, than him who believes ten degrees and lives and speaks only three. These volumes are well worthy the study of the American clergy. They will be found to be eminently beneficial; for on the points where these Sermons are scanty, we already abound, while we but too often are wanting in the qualities of heart that so overflow in the words of Robertson. If, while retaining our clearness of doctrinal statement, and exactness of analysis, we may have more of Robertson's intense sympathy with nature and with man, the American Ministry would receive an indefinite benefit.

We rejoice, then, that these Sermons have had so large a circulation, and shall be glad to see them still more widely read. It is but due to the eminent publishing house, whose imprint they bear, to add that the mechanical execution of the volumes is truly admirable, and leaves nothing to be desired.

DR. FULLER'S SERMONS.* We doubt if any just conception of the real power of any great preacher was ever obtained by the mere reading of his sermons. The published discourse is as unlike the spoken one which the audience heard, as the most accurate portrait, or picture of a landscape or a sunset, is unlike its original. There is wanting the nameless something of the reality. In the highest style of speaking, every feature of the speaker's countenance, and every fibre of his body, pour life into his spoken words. We may gather up those words and print them, every syllable, but like the gathered plants of an herbarium, they lack the impalpable but perceptible principle of life. There is a power in the presence and voice of the living preacher, which no facility of printing can ever supplant; the gospel, if it ever goes forth to the salvation of the race, must proceed from the pulpit, and not from the printing press.

But let no one suppose that we are preparing our readers for a disappointment in Dr. Fuller's sermons. They are at the furthest remove from the class that do their author injustice in the reading. On the contrary, there is in them a depth and breadth of view, a clearness and fulness of doctrinal statement, a compactness of thought, and a wealth of life and earnestness, that engage the attention of all intelligent readers. There is remarkable variety in the sermons themselves, but prominent in them all stands the ever glorious person of Christ. We would that all preachers would so honor their Master. The readers will find in this collection the memorable sermon entitled "The Cross," that produced so powerful an impression when preached before the Baptist Triennial Convention in 1841. There are portions of that sermon that

**Sermons.* By RICHARD FULLER, D. D., of Baltimore. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

will compare to advantage with the most celebrated passages of John M. Mason's "Messiah's Throne."

The sermon on the Deity of Christ will also be found a specimen of close and sound reasoning, not with threadbare arguments, but from premises that will take hold of any audience, and the whole so moulded and pervaded by a spirit of devout earnestness, as to make a powerful appeal both to the understanding and the heart.

Dr. Fuller's preaching, if these sermons are a specimen, is at the utmost remove from the mere harangue and exhortation of many modern popular preachers. With all the aid from his fervor of spirit and force of diction and action, he is evidently accustomed to patient thinking and diligent use of his library. We regret to add that there are occasional statements and forms of expression in the sermons, which will hardly endure criticism. The author tells us, for instance, in the first sermon, that so "peculiar were Christ's yearnings over human misery, that even the exhaustless treasures of the Greek language could furnish no vehicle for their utterance; and the Holy Spirit formed a new word—a word never before nor since used—to express the pangs of the God-man." The author must have forgotten that precisely the same word occurs, both in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke x : 33, and in that of the Prodigal Son, Luke xv : 20. Another form of the same verb may be found in the uninspired Septuagint. The truth rather seems to be, that the word was a Hebraism, and had a very natural origin. We dislike also, the author's title of the first sermon, "The Lonesomeness of Christ." Lonesome is applied rather to the *feelings* than to the *state* or condition of any one. We greatly prefer old Flavel's Solitariness of Christ. But this is a trifle. We wish the sermons could be widely circulated, and carefully read by preachers of the gospel.

GOTTHOLD'S EMBLEMS, BY CHRISTIAN SCRIVER.*—Christian Scriver was a very famous religious writer in Germany during the middle and latter half of the 17th century. "Gotthold's Emblems," or Incidental Meditations, as they were at first entitled, was in its day a very noted book. Edition after edition rapidly followed each other, until it became one of the most familiar and welcome books of devotion in the German language. But like many another old author, it was Scriver's fate to fall into obscurity, from which, after a *long* repose, the literary resurrection, so fashionable in our day, is bringing him again into notice. And old Scriver is proving well worth the trouble of disinterring. Himself profoundly devout while he lived, his written words are still instinct with the life that animated him. Finding a voice celestial in the commonest objects around him, the every-day drudgery of life became transformed to him into the pleasant accompaniments of a conscious journeying to the Heavenly home. A most welcome companion is he, in his Emblems, to those travelling with the same destination. Translated by

* *Gotthold's Emblems; Or, Invisible Things Understood by Things that are Made.* By CHRISTIAN SCRIVER, Minister of Magdeburg in 1671. Translated from the twenty-eighth German Edition, by the Rev. ROBERT MENZIES, Haddam, England. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

the well-tried pen of Rev. Robert Menzies, the volume is an admirable gift book for Christians, both old and young. The style in which the publishers present it to the public is worthy of all praise.

SPECIAL SERMONS.*—Dr. Lathrop, in two discourses preached before the Tabernacle Baptist Church, New-York, in October last, gives very just and scriptural conceptions of "Christian Unity and Christian Charity." Amid a great deal of unmeaning and deceptive talk about union and communion, now prevalent, these Sermons will have a healthful and conservative influence. A Sermon, by Rev. H. L. Wayland, of Worcester, Mass., before the Worcester Baptist Association, in August last, on the "Office of the Cross," presents views of the fact and ground of the offensiveness of the atonement, which are at once discriminating, impressive, and devout. Another Sermon, entitled "The Pulpit and True Freedom," preached in May last, before the Rhode Island Baptist State Convention, is an earnest defence of the pulpit against a perversion of it from the simple office of proclaiming Christ alone as the source of salvation and spiritual freedom to man.

THE PALACE OF THE GREAT KING, BY REV. HOLLIS READ.† Mr. Read is already known as the author of several popular books. Under a somewhat fanciful title, he here endeavors to interpret the voice of universal nature in its proclamation of God. Affluent in language and imagery, and disposed to turn the facts of creation and providence to the service of religion, he takes the reader beneath the earth's crust, and over its surface, and among the creatures that people it, and through the atmosphere that envelopes it, up to the heavens spread above it, pointing out by the aid of the sciences, the facts innumerable and wonderful, that bespeak both the being and the character of the Infinite Maker of all. It may be a useful book in assisting a large class of minds to apprehend the teachings of the world around us.

SPURGEON.‡—Another and sixth volume from this indefatigable young preacher, containing an engraving of the new Tabernacle to be built for him, seems in no way inferior to others that have preceded it.

* *Christian Unity and Christian Charity. Two Discourses, preached, October 23 and October 30, 1859, before the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Second Avenue, New-York. By EDWARD LATHROP, Pastor of the Church. New-York: Sheldon & Company.*

A Sermon, preached before the Worcester Baptist Association, at Southbridge, Aug. 17, 1859. By Rev. H. L. WAYLAND.

The Pulpit and True Freedom; A Sermon, preached before the Rhode Island Baptist State Convention, at Pawtucket, R. I., April 26, 1859. By WILLIAM C. RICHARDS, Pastor of the Brown Street Baptist Church, Providence, R. I. New-York: Sheldon & Company.

† *The Palace of the Great King; or, the Power, Wisdom and Goodness of God illustrated in the multiplicity and variety of his works. By REV. HOLLIS READ author, &c., &c. New-York: C. Scribner. 1859.*

‡ *Sermons Preached and Revised by the Rev. C. H. SPURGEON. Sixth series. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.*

LIFE'S MORNING.* A book more entirely suitable in its contents for the hands of a young Christian, or more beautiful and attractive in its appearance, we do not often see. Could young persons be induced to read such books as this, instead of the absurd religious stories so common in our Sabbath School libraries, there would grow up a healthier piety than is now nurtured in our churches.

THE TEARS OF JESUS; BY DUNCAN.†—The sympathy and compassion of Jesus, as exhibited at the grave of Lazarus and in the lamentation over Jerusalem, are here dwelt on in a series of pathetic and profitable reflections. Dr. Duncan, late pastor of a Baptist church in New-Orleans, is already favorably known as an author, and this little volume will be found equal to his reputation.

CHALLENGE ON BAPTISM IN SPIRIT AND IN FIRE.‡ Mr. Challen is a very industrious and candid writer, who has here given us a very intelligible exposition of baptism in the Spirit, as it is generally understood by the "Reformers," or those known as the adherents of Dr. Alexander Campbell.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING; BY DR. MURRAY.§—On no subject is the Christian public better prepared for a good book than on the Christian Ministry. A little more than a year and a half ago, there appeared in England a small volume, by Rev. Henry Christmas, with precisely the same title as this of Dr. Murray, and which one publishing house, at least, in New-York, thought seriously of publishing. It was rejected, however, for its inadequate treatment, and its unfitness for American readers. Dr. Murray has adopted a very different method from Mr. Christmas, and made a more useful book. The larger portion of it first appeared in short essays in *The New-York Observer*. The reëpearance of the essays in this form will attract to them a new and larger class of readers. Dr. Murray is a deservedly popular writer, and will add to his reputation by this volume.

We cannot, however, forbear saying that the book does not seem to us in all respects worthy of its author's reputation. He is too rambling and desultory—giving, we admit, many useful hints, but, in popularizing what he has to say, is entirely too meagre in his statement and discussion of principles. He has not even ventured to give captions to his chapters. Many of these are too miscellaneous in their contents to

* *Life's Morning; or, Counsels and Encouragements for Youthful Christians.* By the author of "*Life's Evening*," "*Sunday Hours*," &c., &c. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1860.

† *The Tears of Jesus of Nazareth.* By WM. C. DUNCAN, D. D., Pastor of the Coliseum Place Baptist Church, New-Orleans, and Author of the "*Pulpit Gift Book*," &c., &c. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

‡ *Baptism in Spirit and in Fire.* By JAMES CHALLENGE, author of, &c. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1860.

§ *Preachers and Preaching.* By NICHOLAS MURRAY, D. D., Author, &c., &c. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

admit of one, while others with a single theme,—like that on “extempore preaching,”—are too incomplete to be satisfactory in their discussion. One of his best chapters is on the irrelevant subject of “singing and church choirs.”

We notice some statements which we are confident cannot be vindicated; as, for instance, that “Spurgeon has secured a world-wide reputation simply by his oratory.” We believe it is the unanimous verdict of the most competent judges, after the most careful analysis, that the elements of Spurgeon’s power are soundness of doctrine, overmastering faith in the truth of what he preaches, and a self-abandoning earnestness of purpose. It is nonsense to talk of Spurgeon’s oratory. He is simply one of those “living ministers,” an increase of whom Dr. Murray declares to be “the great need of the Church.”

Dr. Murray has many sentences and paragraphs scattered throughout his volume, and one entire chapter, on Denominational Charity and “Christian Union.” To the cursory reader he everywhere breathes a catholic spirit; but, with the most offensive uncharitableness, he pronounces the Episcopal Church “a house of refuge for the feeble-minded,” and the restricted communion of the Baptists “far less Christian than it is fanatical.” His leniency towards the Methodists is a marvel. Its cause is one of those curious questions, the solution of which we could not venture on without recurring to the original essays as published in *The Observer*, or asking if he had his publishers in mind from the outset of their composition. The truth is, the author’s point of view was consciously and most determinedly Presbyterian. His book is, throughout, unscrupulously Presbyterian. It quietly assumes Presbyterianism as unquestioned and unquestionable. It asserts that “the visible Church is composed of true believers and their children,” and “the children of the Church belong to the Church, and should be cared for by the Church.” No amount of talk about “Christian Union” can ever seduce the Baptists into the recognition and fellowship of errors like these.

The book strikes us as an imitation of Dr. Wayland’s “Principles and Practices of Baptists”; but, unlike that volume, it has not on its title-page and back a frank avowal of its denominational bearing and animus,—we will not say purpose.

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

WINER’S GRAMMAR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT DICTION.*—When an author has spent thirty-five of the best years of his life on a book—carefully constructing and emending, and reconstructing it for the *sixth* time—we may justly expect that, if qualified for his task, his work will be complete. That expectation is justified in Winer’s Grammar of the New

* *A Grammar of the New Testament Diction; Intended as an Introduction to a Critical Study of the Greek New Testament.* By GEORGE BENEDICT WINER. Translated from the sixth enlarged and improved edition of the original, by EDWARD MASSON, M. A., formerly Professor in the University of Athens. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1859.

Testament. There was an immense progress in the understanding of the New Testament language and grammar between the commencement and the close of his labors, but at the present stage of our knowledge of that language, his grammar is well-nigh exhaustive. In the hands of our Theological students, such a grammar will be incalculably more valuable than any commentary they can consult. They will find it a condensed commentary in itself, where the meaning is arrived at by the direct process of grammatical induction, and not by the circuitous course of the formal commentator.

It must be borne in mind, however, that Winer, like every one else, has his doctrinal bias, which may effect even his grammatical conclusions. The translator even charges him with "precipitation and unfairness in his decisions on passages directly connected with doctrinal points of vital importance." He tells us he "has, on several occasions, felt compelled to record his dissent, and utter a caution to junior readers, by a brief reference, where Dr. Winer's *doctrinal* view appeared to have unduly influenced his *grammatical* conclusions." All this might have been well enough, had he gone no further. He might have safely been allowed the display of his bias in antagonism to Winer's, had he left unmutilated the text he was professing to translate. But the charge against him, by the *Christian Examiner*, of having omitted from the translation certain passages militating against the Unitarian doctrines, is, we are compelled to say, but too true. He has taken liberties in this respect, for which no just excuse can be offered. It is an impertinence which all right-minded scholars will feel deserving of rebuke, and the more so, as he has failed to forewarn the reader of the omission. It matters not though the value of the Grammar remain unimpaired, or even be enhanced (and in fact the excised passages are of but very little account), they should nevertheless have been retained. The Translation otherwise, so far as we have had time to compare it with the original, while free in its rendering and sometimes overlooking words that give special shading to the thought, appears, on the whole, to have been faithfully executed. The Grammar is of inestimable value to the higher class of biblical students.

STIER'S WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.*—It is now twenty years since this commentary was first published in Germany; and, from its first appearance, it has always been highly appreciated by the Evangelical Christians. The American publishers are doing a good service to Christianity in bringing an English translation within reach of our biblical students.

Stier is broadly distinguished, in several respects, from all contemporary German commentators. He regards it "as a thing impossible, to construct a detailed historical harmony of the Gospels," because the

* *The Words of the Lord Jesus.* By RUDOLF STIER, Doctor of Theology, Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkeuditz. Translated from the Second Revised and Enlarged German Edition, by the Rev. WM. B. POPE, London. New Edition. Vols. 1 and 2 bound in one. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1859.

The same Work, vols. 3 and 4 bound in one. By the same house.

Holy Spirit had something incomparably more important to communicate than the mere time, place and circumstance, in which the deeds and discourses of the Gospels took place. With him, there "is deeper significance in any one word of the Lord Jesus, which He himself spoke, (Acts, xx: 35,) than in all the sayings of the Apostles and Prophets." This distinction between parts of Scripture, however, we cannot but regard as wholly unfounded.

Stier also believes that we have in the Evangelists, *essentially*, though not in the very letter, the *ipsipima verba* of Christ himself. He "holds fast" the doctrine of a "rigid, yet not mechanical, Inspiration" of the Scriptures, and it is this, with his uncompromising hostility to every form and vestige of rationalism, to which may be attributed the "persevering injustice" he complains of from his contemporaries. No German commentator of the generation now growing old, can be compared with him for strenuous support of the full Inspiration of the Scriptures. His conception of the relation of Christ's words to Himself as the Eternal Word, has given him a notion of the inexhaustableness and infinity of their meaning, which leads him at times into distinctions, and fancies, and details, that make him, in the estimation of some, too voluminous to be a good commentator, but the value of his matter soon reconciles to his prolixity. No two exegetes could be more totally unlike, in respect of *bulk*, not to say spirit, than he and De Wette. There are scores of biblical students and ministers to whom, even with a knowledge of the German, De Wette would be a useless help, while Stier would be welcomed as a treasure.

PAROCHIAL LECTURES ON THE PSALMS, BY REV. DAVID CALDWELL.*—These Lectures breathe a devoutly evangelical spirit, and are written in a style of considerable liveliness and warmth. A tone of rich and deep religious experience runs through the expositions, giving evidence of a deep heart-acquaintance with the doctrines and sentiment set forth in the compositions of the inspired Psalmist. The Lectures must have been edifying, heard from the pulpit, and they may be profitably read. They have been prepared with the help of the accumulated literature on the Psalms, but are not without originality of thought and freshness of illustration.

The author's general treatment of the Messianic Psalms is very satisfactory, particularly his treatment of Ps. xxii and xlv. His treatment of the xvi Psalm is a partial exception to the general excellence of his exposition, and in two particulars:

1st, The author, contrary to our settled conviction of the true principle, makes the Psalm partly Messianic and partly non-Messianic, as to its subject.

2d, Consequently, he makes the Apostles Peter and Paul to have only *applied* v. 10 to our Savior's resurrection. An examination of the Apostles' quotation of the passage will show that it was used in argument with the Jews, in proof of the Messiahship of Jesus, in a connection

* *Parochial Lectures on the Psalms.* By the late Rev. DAVID CALDWELL, A. M. Ps. 1—50. Philadelphia: Wm. S. & Alfred Martien. 1859.

where the whole value of the apostolic reasoning depends on the text in the Psalm being *limited* to Christ, as a prediction of his resurrection *exclusively*.

It is not, therefore, directly, as the author supposes, but only by implication, that the Psalm teaches the doctrine of a resurrection and an immortality for any but our Lord Jesus.

THOLUCK ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, TRANSLATED BY KRAUTH.*—It was but a few months ago that we called the attention of our readers to this commentary. We can now only add, that while less elaborate and learned in special discussions than the later editions of the author's commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, or on the Sermon on the Mount, it will yet be more acceptable than either of those to the ordinary, educated pastor. We know of no special work on the Gospel of John that, in an English dress, could prove so welcome and useful to our American ministry. The loving spirit and glowing piety, so manifest in all Tholuck's commentaries, seem specially conspicuous in this, where the author dwells on the congenial words of the beloved disciple. We could wish Tholuck were less lax in his views of inspiration; but these views are far less apparent, and present themselves in less objectionable forms in this volume, than in his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Hebrews or the Romans.

We must express our gratification with the whole appearance of the volume, as well as with the superior accuracy of rendering, and the correctness of the style, in comparison with the translations in "Clarke's Foreign Theological Library."

JAMIESON ON THE PENTATEUCH AND THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.†—In this volume, as in Brown's Commentary on the Gospels, published by the same house, there is a great amount of commentary crowded into a very small space. In a convenient duodecimo we have a really valuable and suggestive explanation of all the books of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, one that will be of great service to Sunday School teachers and private Christians, and one that the professional scholar need not despise. The book is almost a marvel in the way of "much in little." True, the reading of its pages will test the soundness of the optic nerve. But what with the excellence of the paper and the general clearness of the type, less difficulty than might be apprehended will be experienced.

The comments may be characterized as scholarly, neat, compressed, and suggestive. Ministers of small means for the purchase of books, in making expository lectures on the Pentateuch and Joshua, will find their account in consulting this volume; for the expositions here given, though

* *Commentary on the Gospel of John.* By Dr. AUGUSTUS THOLUCK. Translated from the German by CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.

† *The Pentateuch, and the Book of Joshua, with an Original and Copious Critical and Explanatory Commentary.* By the Rev. ROBERT JAMIESON, D. D., Minister of St. Paul's Parish, Glasgow, Scotland. Philadelphia: Wm. S. & Alfred Martien. 1860.

exceedingly brief, are the fruit of the careful study and judicious weighing of authorities, as well as of critical attention to the original text.

From many of the author's interpretations we dissent, but with most of them we heartily agree, including many when he differs from the majority of commentators. Mr. Jamieson has often caught *the significant point* of a passage, and has, in a happily chosen word, indicated its relation to the analogy of Scripture. As instances of his felicity in this particular, we would refer to his short comments on Gen., iii: 24, iv: 7-24. We gladly welcome the publication of such volumes amongst us, for we are sure they will promote the study and help to the understanding of the Sacred Scriptures.

PHILOSOPHY.

DR. WAYLAND'S INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY.*—We avail ourselves of the occasion of the transfer of this work from a Boston to a New-York publishing house, to express anew our estimate of its merits. The words "twelfth thousand," on the title-page, are proof that it is appreciated by the public; while the name of its veteran author, distinguished in the walks of education and religious literature, would of itself be ample guaranty for its excellence. A work on Intellectual Philosophy, from the pen of Dr. Wayland, could not but be marked by great clearness and precision of statement, by a lucid and natural arrangement of topics, by sound and judicious views, and by a constant and skilful application of its abstract truths to the great purposes of intellectual and moral culture. All these qualities this work possesses in an eminent degree, and they combine to render it one of the very best text-books in mental science which our prolific time has originated. We have heard some of our ablest Metaphysical teachers, after having tried other works more pretentious, express a conviction of the superior adaptedness of that of Dr. Wayland to the purposes of mental training.

In the present transition state of Mental Science, while it remains uncertain what results of the splendid scholarship and daring speculations of Sir William Hamilton will be permanently wrought into our systems of Metaphysics, and what will finally be discredited by the searching criticisms to which the great critic is being subjected, Dr. Wayland has done wisely, we think, to abide in the camp of the conservatives; to tread in the path of Reid and Stewart, incorporating occasionally some of the more unquestionable fruits of Continental speculation. Thus his work, if it refrains from grappling with some of the abstruser problems of Metaphysical Psychology, is a rich repository of the leading acknowledged truths in this department. Every page bears evidence of the conscientious industry and skill of the practical Christian teacher, and we trust that in large numbers of our Seminaries of various grades this book will long continue the guide into this rugged yet attractive and most important science.

* *The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND, late President of Brown University, &c. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

We will just refer to one or two particulars. We agree with Dr. Wayland in the opinion that sight gives immediately the idea of extension, as well as of color, and of extension in different dimensions. We cannot concur with him—although we believe he has nearly all the authorities on his side—in the doctrine that smell and taste do not, as well as sight and hearing, give us the idea of externality. We see no reason for assuming, in this respect, a radical difference between the senses. Sight and hearing give vastly more ideas of external objects than smell and taste; but we believe that all alike give primarily and at once the idea of something exterior to and unlike the mind. Consciousness, Dr. Wayland, with the old psychologists, restricts to a cognizance of our mental acts. He is not, with Hamilton, conscious of a tree, but only of his perception of a tree. He coincides also with those who make it a distinct faculty, and maintains the propriety of distinguishing between perception and the consciousness of perception, on the ground that we may have perceptions without consciousness. We admit the distinction, but not the fact assigned in proof of it. We hold consciousness to be an essential condition of perception, and that in cases of seeming unconsciousness the act was so slight as to be subsequently forgotten. We believe them separable, like the convexity and concavity of a circular line, logically, not in fact. But this merely in passing. We renew our expressions of the high value of the work, and follow with our blessing its veteran author to the rest which he has so richly earned by his long continued labors in Christian education and Christian literature.

DR. DAGG'S MORAL SCIENCE.*—Dr. Dagg proposes no new method, and no new theory in this volume. He recognizes Dr. Wayland's treatise on Moral Science, as "a work of high and deserved reputation," to which "he has been much indebted," but assigns its "imperfections, which twenty-four years of critical examination have sufficed to discover," as a reason for undertaking a new work. "Some of Dr. Wayland's important doctrines are controverted in both theoretical and practical ethics." We have not time or space at present for examination or notification to our readers of the points of this difference, but can only assure them they are not fundamental, or such as can bring either of the philosophers into serious conflict.

Dr. Dagg, like Prof. Haven, but unlike Drs. Wayland and Alexander, assigns the question "whether conscience be a distinct faculty of the mind," to the domain of Mental Science, and consequently omits it from this treatise. Unlike Prof. Haven, and rightly, we think, he makes the foundation of moral obligation to be in the will and nature of God. Dr. Dagg tells us in his preface, that "a true system of Ethics must of necessity refer to the Bible, the highest standard of morals." Precisely how much is here intended by the word *refer*, we are at a loss to determine. The precise relation of moral science to Revelation or the Bible, is a question that we think should be briefly, but fundamentally,

* *The Elements of Moral Science.* By J. L. DAGG, D. D., late President of Mercer University, Ga. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

discussed in a preliminary chapter of any treatise on moral science, designed to be a text book in our schools and colleges. We may discard the old German distinction between Dogmatic Theology and Moral Theology, but we should beware of attempting to establish a system of Ethics, which are simply to be buttressed or sanctioned by the Scriptures. Dr. Dagg, however, intends this volume to be a "supplement" to the two on Theology, and as those extended his reputation as a theologian, so this will add to it as a Christian philosopher.

BUTLER'S ETHICS, BY DR. CHAMPLIN.*—No English writer has so much influenced the present ethical thinking of the British and American mind as Bishop Butler. To no one else is all that is now healthful and valuable in that thinking so much indebted. The debt is most fully acknowledged by those most competent to estimate its amount. To repeat the names of those who have made emphatic avowal of the obligation, would be to repeat some of the most distinguished names among our modern writers. And the merits of Butler were never so fully recognized, or so profoundly revered, as they are to-day among the leading minds of Oxford, where his name, if not always his principles and method, has been fondly and proudly cherished.

The current Ethical Philosophy of this country cannot be understood or intelligently taught, without a recurrence to its first principles as evolved by Butler. It is singular enough that these principles should be found in sermons, and in sermons whose publication depended, according to their author's own words, on "circumstances in a great measure accidental." But Butler's sermons have never proved very attractive to students, or even to a large number of older and maturer minds. Pres. Champlin, it seems to us, has done an eminently good work in selecting those portions of the Sermons and the Essay on Virtue, which contain Butler's ethical principles, and in arranging the whole with a running analysis, as a Treatise on Moral Science. A more careful study of Butler would be a safeguard against the nonsense of a Moral Science that would make "worthiness of spiritual approbation" to be the highest good, and "personal worthiness the end of all action."

We could wish Dr. Champlin had been a little more copious in his notes, pointing out to the student the conflict of opinions which were the occasion of the Sermons and their sentiments. We wish, also, he had been a little more full and explicit in the brief note on the etymology of *wrong*, in which he affirms that "right and wrong have their foundation in the nature of things." If we understand this language we should be compelled to dissent from it.

* *Bishop Butler's Ethical Discourses and Essay on Virtue. Arranged as a Treatise on Moral Philosophy, and Edited, with an Analysis, by J. T. CHAMPLIN, D. D., President of Waterville College. Boston: John P. Jewett & Company.*

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

DR. HENRY B. SMITH'S CHURCH HISTORY IN CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.*—To write a Manual of Church History in synchronistic tables was a formidable undertaking. Others have prepared, with various degrees of fulness, tables of the dates and facts of that history, but a complete tabular view, containing "a digest of the subject-matter" of the history itself, was a task before which most men would have long hesitated. Prof. Smith undertook it, and, we are glad to say, has performed it with signal ability. Those best acquainted with the labor and patience required of him, and most competent to appreciate his success, will be the readiest to recognize the great value of his Manual. Both the teacher and the student of the History of the Church will here find, directly under their eye, a complete view of the synchronistic relations of the Church at any given date, both external and internal, which might require many a weary hour to bring into so exact and reliable a form. The value of a tabular view, which thus arranges and classifies the materials of history, can hardly be overestimated.

To bring all the multifarious events of any single age directly under the eye of the reader, was a most difficult point to be gained, however ample the page; but by the simple invention of a leaf shorter and narrower than the page bearing the dates, though otherwise exactly conformed to it, the desired end is fully secured. No one who has any interest in the History of the Church, and has made use of these Tables, would consent to be without them. Their intrinsic value is greatly enhanced by the Appendix and minute Index with which they are accompanied. It would be easy to point out mistakes in the last two Tables on the History of the Church in America, but we forbear the ungracious task of petty criticism on a work of so great merit.

DR. KILLEN ON THE ANCIENT CHURCH.†—This work bears marks of independent thinking, of true historical insight, and exact, if not comprehensive learning in the department of Ancient Church History. One of its most noticeable features is an elaborate discussion of the question of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles. As the result of his discussion, the author reaches the conclusion that these Epistles "are utterly spurious, and should be swept away from among the genuine remains of early Church literature, with the besom of scorn." Though unable to agree fully with Dr. K. in his emphatic and indis-

* *History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables; a Synchronistic View of the Events, Characteristics, and Culture of each Period, including the History of Polity, Worship, Literature, and Doctrines; together with two Supplementary Tables upon the Church in America; and an Appendix, containing the series of Councils, Popes, Patriarchs, and other Bishops, and a full Index.* By HENRY B. SMITH, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the City of New-York. New-York: Charles Scribner. 1859.

† *The Ancient Church; its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution, traced for the First Three Hundred Years.* By W. D. KILLEN, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. New-York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1859. pp. 656, 8 vo.

criminate condemnation, we nevertheless admit that his examination shows most conclusively that the so-called Ignatian Epistles are of no value in determining the question of the existence of Episcopacy at the beginning of the second century. Of his other investigations, none is more worthy of special attention than that respecting the causes of the origin and growth of Hierarchical Prerogative in the early Church.

The least valuable portion of the work is its History of Doctrines. The fact that the history of the doctrine of the Trinity is disposed of in four pages; that of the Person of Christ in two; and that of the Atonement in three lines quoted from Clemens Alexandrinus, shows that the most important branch of Ancient Church History has received only a very imperfect and unsatisfactory treatment. That Dr. Killen sometimes deduces very positive and general conclusions from an exceedingly small basis of facts, every careful reader of this volume will be forced to admit. For example: Polycarp is reported to have said, on the eve of his martyrdom, A. D. 167, that he had served Christ eighty and six years; and Justin Martyr, writing about the same time, testifies that there were then many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years of age, who had been disciples of Christ from childhood (*ἐκ παιδῶν*). Now, upon the simple basis of these two statements, it is affirmed that "infant baptism *must therefore* have been an institution of the age of the Apostles." Of a similar character, also, are the assertions that Congregationalism has no solid foundation either in Scripture or Antiquity, and that the Church Courts of the second and third centuries were simply the continuation and expansion of the Synods which met in the days of the Apostles.

THE PURITANS AND QUEEN ELIZABETH; BY SAMUEL HOPKINS.*—It is the aim of the author of this work,—which is to be completed in three volumes,—to combine the most rigorous exactness of historical truth with the dialogue and scenic picturing of a historical romance. And almost every page bears witness, by its foot-notes and citations of authorities, to the thorough research and fidelity with which he has entered upon his task. There is equal evidence of the author's skill in narration and the management of his characters. If the absorbing interest with which the reader is borne along in the narrative is any test, the author has been signally successful in the execution of his purpose. The dash of the quaint and the antique in the English dialogues, and the sprinkling of Scotch in the talk of John Knox, give piquancy and raciness to the whole, as well as set in strong relief the rounded, polished periods of the more distinctively historical portions. It is but a sad picture the author gives of certain well-known historical personages of the period covered by his History. But we must not forestall a more formal review in a future number.

* *The Puritans ; or the Church, Court, and Parliament of England, during the Reigns of Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth.* By SAMUEL HOPKINS. In three volumes. Vol. I. Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

MARY HOWITT'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.*—No one will expect Mary Howitt to contribute anything new to our knowledge of American history. But the great facts of our story, arranged by her skilful hand and adorned by her genial and practised pen, will arrest the attention of many readers who might be repelled from the more elaborate and multiplied pages of Bancroft, and Hildreth, and Tucker.

TULLOCH'S LEADERS OF THE REFORMATION.† Four miniature pictures, with features exceedingly distinct, and on the whole very true to their originals, are contained in this volume. Luther, Calvin, Latimer, and Knox, are here sketched by the hand of no mean artist. Many others have essayed to portray the Reformers, but Dr. Tulloch is not a copyist. Like every artist, he has projected something of himself upon his pictures, but only enough to make life-like their expression.

These Lectures are not mere gleanings from other men's labors, nor yet are they the results of independent investigation. His task, which was simply to deliver four lectures before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, did not require or admit of extended research or minute criticism; it only required a discreet use of the best labors of others, with occasional verification of their authorities. That use he has made, and the result is, four lectures which readers of all grades of attainment will find neither unreadable nor unprofitable.

It is a curious question how Presbyterian Scotland could relish such a view of Calvin as is here given, especially from the hand of a Principal and Primarius Professor of Theology at old St. Andrews. It is marvellously un-Scottish and disrespectful to *jure divino* Presbyterianism.

HISTORY OF INDEPENDENCE HALL, BY D. W. BELISLE.‡ Visitors to Independence Hall, the "Cradle of American Liberty," at Philadelphia, often feel the want of reliable information respecting the persons and events commemorated by the portraits and relics there collected. To supply this want, Mr. Belisle has prepared, not merely a guide-book, but a veritable history. He has found the preparation an "arduous task" in which he has "consulted sufficient standard authorities to give his history reliable accuracy in every particular." Mr. Belisle should know it is a perversion of terms to call Independence Hall a "holy edifice." His book would lose nothing by a style of writing a little less ambitious and more strictly conformed to the established usages of our language.

* *A Popular History of the United States of America; from the Discovery of the American Continent to the Present Time.* By MARY HOWITT. Illustrated with numerous engravings. Two vols. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

† *Leaders of the Reformation: Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, the Representative Men of Germany, France, England and Scotland.* By JOHN TULLOCH, D. D., Principal and Primarius Professor of Theology, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews; author of "Theism," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

‡ *History of Independence Hall, from the earliest period to the present time. Embracing biographies of the immortal signers of the Declaration of Independence, with historical sketches of the sacred relics preserved in that sanctuary of American freedom.* By D. W. BELISLE. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son.

REMINISCENCES OF RUFUS CHOATE, BY E. G. PARKER.*—Rufus Choate was at once a great lawyer and a great orator; a many-sided man, whose legal learning, and fervid eloquence, and scholarly attainments and tastes and habits, whose quenchless love of "literature and all knowledge," and tireless industry in his pursuits, made him a man of mark and of wide-reaching influence. Submitting through life to the drudgery and routine of a mere lawyer, he was yet keenly alive to whatever concerned him as a man, a scholar, a citizen, a husband, a father, a friend. Mr. Choate sought fervently, throughout his days, to mould and maintain himself to the standard of manly completeness.

The author of these *Reminiscences* was an admiring friend, whose friendship and intimacy first began when a student in Mr. Choate's office. He tells us, "I observed and studied him every day of my life for ten years." He also, in another place, informs us that his personal acquaintance continued uninterrupted for fourteen or fifteen years. A most fascinating book is the result, and in a form to the highest degree creditable to its publishers. Its scraps of conversation, its criticisms on men and things, its numerous accounts of law cases and arguments, its numberless hints and facts for the stimulus and encouragement of young men just entering on their professions, and the never-failing spirit of joyous life and labor, caught from Mr. Choate and spread like a contagion over all its pages, give to the volume a resistless charm.

We are glad to see so effectually put to rest, the charge against Mr. Choate of opium eating. His eminent success, it is evident, could never have been attained had he been addicted to that habit, and the wide-spread slander, if uncontradicted, would have wrought irreparable mischief among the young and ambitious.

Mr. Parker writes in a genial and hearty spirit, exhibiting on every page a loving appreciation of Mr. Choate's character and attainments, and portraying him to us in the most various and striking attitudes. We could wish, however, that the author had more carefully digested and arranged his materials. His plan seems to have been neither chrono-logical, nor according to the logic of any special relation; the consequence is some confusion and repetition.

Mr. Parker is in no danger of being regarded by his readers as a religious man. We are afraid he is hardly just to Mr. Choate's religious views and faith. After stating decidedly Mr. Choate's want of "unshaken confidence in anything" beyond "what he saw," he says, "the remarks of his minister at his funeral would indicate that he accepted the Christian Religion"! This will hardly be regarded as courteous to Dr. Adams, by those who have read that gentleman's remarks at the funeral, and will suggest the inquiry whether Mr. Parker was the man to whom Mr. Choate, with all their intimacy, ever granted a look into the inner sanctuary of his heart. But after all, we thank Mr. Parker for his attractive volume.

* *Reminiscences of Rufus Choate, the great American Advocate.* By EDWARD G. PARKER. New-York: Mason Brothers. 1860.

THE EIGHTEEN CHRISTIAN CENTURIES, BY THE REV. JAS. WHITE.*—Mr. White is favorably known in this country through the re-publication of his *History of France*, a work that, in moderate compass, sets forth the leading events of that history with skill and attractiveness.

The aim of the present work is to arrange, in the form of continuous narrative, the more striking historical facts of the eighteen Christian centuries, with a somewhat special reference to the progress and effects of Christianity. The volume is not a mere epitome of history, nor is it a dry collection of facts, but it consists of a series of well-drawn and mutually related historical pictures.

The particular plan of the author is to seize on the most characteristic mark of each successive century, to get at its main thought, its prevailing moral or political movement, and with this to connect all the great historical incidents and movements of that century. Mr. White guards measurably against the arbitrary grouping of events, to which this plan naturally leads, by sometimes tracing the continuance of influences and tendencies from one century to another, and by sometimes adverting to the undercurrents of the world's life that are always moving beneath the outward and obvious phenomena of the centuries, and that silently change the whole course of history. He thus avoids stiffly adjusting all the facts of a period to any formal definition of its characteristic feature.

The author's style is a good one for historical narrative. Without being particularly brilliant and fascinating, it is clear, chaste, and solid, well adapted to wholesome tastes. Every page of the volume gives evidence of the careful study of the sources of history, and those sources have been used for the construction of a fresh, comprehensive, and instructive resumé of the great events of the eighteen Christian centuries. A somewhat rare feature for so small a work, but a most valuable one, is the full index that accompanies it. We commend the example thus furnished to all book-makers. Any work worth publishing, is worth being well indexed.

WOMEN ARTISTS, BY MRS. ELLET.†—When so much is written of what women might, could, would, or should do, it is refreshing to take up one book treating of what she has done. Woman's work has been so uniformly presented as potentially imperfect, that this indicative, perfect aspect of it awakens in us quite a new sensation. Mrs. Ellet has brought together the names of nearly five hundred women artists of greater or less eminence, and from all times and countries, forming the first collection of the kind ever made, we believe, in the English language. Some of these daughters of genius are merely alluded to; of the lives of others only the outlines and a few circumstances are given, but the artist career of not a few is presented in instructive and most

* *The Eighteen Christian Centuries.* By the Rev. JAMES WHITE, Author of the "*History of France.*" From the second Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillen. 1859.

† *Women Artists in all Ages and Countries.* By MRS. ELLET. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

entertaining detail. The book is written in Mrs. Ellet's easy, pleasant style, and is free from any attempt at technical criticism. It abounds in illustrations of the necessity of resolution and patient industry to the achievement of enduring results, even under circumstances most favorable to success. At a time when every young lady takes lessons in drawing and painting, but when only at rare intervals one can be found knowing enough of either to sketch a flower growing in her garden, or to color a bit of landscape seen from her window, a book like this, by stimulating to thoroughness and to the attainment of true excellence, is worth more than a whole course of instruction such as is commonly given in our female seminaries. Ruskin says that "*any one* can learn to draw well," and that "it is much easier to learn to draw well than to learn to play well on any musical instrument." But excellence can never be attained in an art of which the student has only the lowest conceptions. While young ladies are so instructed that their highest aspirations find satisfaction in a mechanical copy of a pitiable pattern, we must expect neither enthusiasm nor excellence; indeed, so far as their æsthetic culture is concerned, their cats, dogs, and trees might as well be put with worsted, as with paint, upon canvas; the worsted copy deserving the preference, inasmuch as it may be turned to some account. We wish that Mrs. Ellet's "*Women Artists*" might be put in the hands of every female teacher and student of art in the country.

BENEDICT'S FIFTY YEARS AMONG THE BAPTISTS.*—The veteran historian of the Baptists, now an octogenarian, in taking us rapidly through a half century of his experience, tells us of the men he has known, the scenes he has participated in, the events he has witnessed and studied, the changes he has witnessed, and the opinions he has formed. His volume is studded with useful hints and items of information. Making allowance for some oddities of style, for which may be pleaded the license of age and the usages of a former generation, his volume will instruct those now living, and be a source of information to the future historian. We had marked several passages to which we wished to call the attention of our readers—for we believe in remembering and pondering the ways of our fathers—but our limited space will not admit them.

We are constrained to believe that the author's views of theological education, and the method of acquiring it, are not warranted by the largest experience. It is the conviction of those who have had most to do with the practical education of ministers, that a *Theological Department* in connection with a College, is not the best method. So strong had this conviction become that, when the University of Rochester was founded, there *was not*, as the author supposes, a Theological Department attached to it. On the contrary, there were founded two Institutions: a College or University, and a Theological Seminary, with two separate charters, and totally distinct Faculties of instruction and government. Even at Hamilton there is a growing disposition, we believe, to separate the two

**Fifty Years among the Baptists.* By DAVID BENEDICT, D. D., author of "*Baptist History*," "*All Religions*," &c., &c. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

departments as far as their organization will admit. Their Theological Department is publicly designated a Theological Seminary. Dr. Benedict, we think, has not yet got hold of the specific for the disease of clerical inefficiency; he has not yet got his eye on either the real seat or the cause of the malady.

We are sorry to find Dr. Benedict repeating the substance of a statement emphatically made by one of our distinguished writers not long ago, that our Baptist Theological Seminaries are *copied* from other denominations. If it be meant that the subjects studied are the same in all Theological Seminaries, there need be no dispute. So are the studies of all the Common Schools identical; as also are those of all the Colleges. But if it be meant that the methods of study and practical training are copied by Baptists from other denominations, we think this is a mistake. There is a remarkable diversity in the methods of Theological Training throughout the country. The fact is, the Baptists started Theological Seminaries, just as did other denominations, only when the great changes in the curriculum of College studies made it necessary. The attention once given to Theology in our Colleges has been gradually growing less, till we do not now know of a College in the Northeastern States, in which any distinctively *theological* instruction forms a part of the regular course. Dr. Benedict's views of ministerial education, must be, we think, every way more just and liberal than would be gathered from his statement, that the "main business" of the Theological schools is "to teach men how to preach and perform pastoral duties"!

THE HOUSEHOLD LIBRARY,* is a series of small and beautiful volumes, containing the lives of noted persons from some of the most distinguished of modern pens. Among the later volumes are, a *Life of Julius Cæsar*, from the Roman History of Dean Liddell, one of the authors of the Greek Lexicon; the *Life of Vittoria Colonna*, a high-born poetess and protestant of Italy in the sixteenth century, by J. Adolphus Trollope, son of the once famous Mrs. Trollope; and the *life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, by Lamartine. This collection is admirably suited to those family libraries which must be small and should, therefore, be select.

TRAVELS.

AT HOME AND ABROAD; BY BAYARD TAYLOR.†—This popular author and traveller here gives us forty sketches of men, scenery, modes of life, and personal experience in travel, which, having been published as detached pieces during several year past, he has now gathered up, and

**Life of Julius Cæsar*, by HENRY D. LIDDELL, D. D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

Life of Vittoria Colonna, by J. ADOLPHUS TROLLOPE. Same house.

Life of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, by ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE. Same house.

†*At Home and Abroad: A Sketch Book of Life, Scenery and Men.* By BAYARD TAYLOR. New-York: G. P. Putnam, 115 Nassau street. 1850.

combined into a volume. The collection will, doubtless, give more satisfaction to a large class of readers, than a continuous narrative. The volume contains an account of his first journey. Thrown off, as we may suppose the sketches to have been, when the author was in his best mood, they are in his happiest style. Always cheerful, and looking upon life with a poet's eye, never himself troubled or troubling others with his scruples or convictions, he is, in the estimation of many, one of the most companionable of men in his sketches of travel.

THE PRAIRIE TRAVELLER, BY CAPT. MARCY,* with multifarious information, respecting the boundless West, and its frontier life, its warfare and wayfare, and courses of travel, and whatever else one needs or wishes to know, is a most instructive book for all kinds of readers; and, for travellers in those distant regions, reliable as it unquestionably is, in its statements and facts, must be an indispensable hand-book and guide.

LIFE AND TRAVELS OF ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT.†—No adequate life of Alexander Von Humboldt can be written, which is not quite as much a book of travels, as it is a biography. We accordingly find the author of this life not advancing more than twenty-five pages in his task before he enters upon Humboldt's travels, which are continued through nearly four hundred pages. Humboldt's last thirty years, though laborious in study, and varied in experience, at Berlin, that centre of intellectual life for Prussia, are disposed of within the space of seventy pages. But this anonymous author has given us a very attractive book. Making free use of Klencke's clumsy but authentic memoirs, and drawing facts from the works of Humboldt himself, his purpose has been to write a popular life, and he has "taken great pains to make it accurate." We believe him to have eminently succeeded. With a natural plan, and a lucid order, with a graceful and pleasing style, the author has succeeded in giving us a clearer conception of the great Expounder of the Cosmos, whether in his travels, his person, his habits or his studies, than we have been able to obtain from any other source.

BELLES-LETTRES.

DIES IRÆ.‡—On taking this little volume into our hands, we had, first of all to admire the rare beauty of all its external appointments. Printed on thick, mellow-tinted paper, in clear, antique type, with just a dash of antique illumination, and with relieving margins; embel-

**The Prairie Traveller. A hand-book for Overland Expeditions. With Maps, Illustrations, and Itineraries of the Principal Routes, between the Mississippi and the Pacific.* By RANDOLPH B. MARCY, Captain U. S. Army. Published by authority of the War Department. New-York: Harper Brothers. 1859.

†*The Life, Travels and Books of Alexander Von Humboldt, with an Introduction* by BAYARD TAYLOR. New-York: Rudd & Carleton, 130 Grand street.

‡*Dies Iræ in thirteen original versions.* By ABRAHAM COLES, M. D. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859.

lished by two exquisite photographs, not pasted, but taken on the page, from fine engravings of Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment" and Ary Scheffer's magnificent "Christus Judicator," and combining in its binding strength with elegant simplicity, its external is a fit and beautiful setting for the more beautiful gem which it contains.

In an introduction of seven pages, Dr. Coles characterizes the *Dies Iræ* with a chaste and fervent glow of diction, which reveals how thoroughly he has studied, and how deeply he has entered into the spirit of the poem. Comparing it with other Latin hymns, he says: "It has superior beauties, with none of their defects. For the most part, they are more or less Romish; but this is Catholic, and not Romish at all. It is universal as humanity. It is the cry of the human. It bears indubitable marks of being a personal experience.—One great secret of the power and enduring popularity of this hymn is, undoubtedly, its genuineness. A vital sincerity breathes throughout. Underneath every word and syllable, a living heart throbs and pulsates."

After giving a history of the hymn—its authorship, its additions, abbreviations, and variations—Dr. Coles devotes several pages to an account of its translations, noticing Lisco's German collection, and paying an honorable tribute to the versions of Crashaw and of the Earl of Roscommon in the English. In reference to his own translations, he says that it has been his aim "to be in all cases as faithful as possible to the sense and spirit of the original, and likewise to the letter, but not so slavishly as to preclude variety. He has endeavored to carry out likeness in unlikeness, and to give each version, so far as practicable, the interest of a distinct poem." Of Dr. Coles's remarkable success as respects these particulars, no one, competent to judge, can doubt. It is true, the subtle spirit that vivifies the words of a language can never be transferred, without loss or change, to a foreign body; and hence no poem can be translated into another speech without losing something of its original significance and beauty. The Gothic strength, the stern simplicity, the passionate brevity, the concentrated energy, and the deep undertone of pathos of this grand old canticle, present to the translator internal difficulties, which, along with those of its metrical structure (trochaic verse, with ternary double rhyme), can, doubtless, never be entirely overcome. But Dr. Coles has, we believe, conquered them more fully than any English translator who has yet attempted the task. The advantage which the German has over the English, in its wealth of words suited to the double rhyme, removes from the way of a translator into that language, one great obstacle to success. We have not yet had the opportunity of comparing the versions of Dr. Coles with those of Lisco's collection. But for all that enters into a good translation, fidelity to the sense of the original, uniform conformity to its tenses, preservation of its metrical form without awkwardly inverting, inelegantly abbreviating, or violently straining the sense of words, and the reproduction of its vital spirit,—for all these qualities, Dr. Coles's first translation stands, we believe, not only unsurpassed, but unequalled in the English language.

The version of Rev. Richard C. Trench, commencing "O, that day, that day of ire," is very faithful, but lacks the double rhyme so essential to the rounding out of the noble cadence of the poem. The transla-

tion of Rev. Dr. Irons, so highly commended not long since in the North British Review, preserves, though with apparent labor, the metrical form of the original, but after a careful comparison of it with Dr. Coles's first version, and of both with the original, we do not hesitate to say, that in correctness, vigor and grace of rendering, the English must be held altogether inferior to the American translation. Crashaw's version is in single rhymed couplets repeated, like Dr. Coles's last rendering, and the Earl of Roscommon's, in single rhymed triplets of iambic verse, both failing in metrical conformity to the original. We should be glad to vindicate our statement of the superiority of Dr. Coles's versions, by comparing them more minutely and with careful reference to the original, with those mentioned above, if our limits would admit of it.

All the versions of the *Dies Iræ* we have yet seen, translate "Huic" in the last line of the last stanza, in the third person, referring to "homo" of the preceding line. Would it not be more forcible to render it in the first person? If it be said that this use of the demonstrative pronoun is not common, is it not sufficient to reply that the *Dies Iræ* is not classical, but mediæval Latin? But such a construction, though not common, does no violence, we believe, to good Latin usage. Every one knows that the fundamental distinction between the three demonstratives *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, is personal; this of mine, that of yours, that of his. A similar use of the pronoun may be found in Horace, (Lib. 1, Sat. 9, l. 47). "*Homo*," to which "*huic*" refers, is of course, generic. Does the prayer to spare the *race* comport with the conviction which underlies the whole poem, and is so powerfully expressed in the 16th and 17th stanzas, that that last day will be a day of doom and final separation? Does it accord with the intense individuality of the poem, which is a cry from the convulsed depths of a man's soul for his own salvation? "*Me*, save me," is its agonizing burden; "in that day of universal judgment spare *me*." Is not the force of the whole poem weakened by giving to "*huic*" a general signification? Or, if it may be supposed that the author's sympathy, as he closes, is transferred to the race of which he forms a part, or that, at the last, he merges himself in the race, it should not be forgotten that the concluding stanzas of the received version were formed from the first three of a supplement of eight verses made by a later author, and that this last line, "*Huic ergo parce, Deus*," is, in the supplement, followed by another, "*Esto semper adjutor meus*." But this is rather a point of inquiry than of criticism.

In an appendix, Dr. Coles has given a lucid explanation of that part of the Roman Mass called the Sequence, to which, in the mass for the dead, this poem is applied. The grand old Gregorian chant, to which the *Dies Iræ* is sung, completes this singularly beautiful book, a unique gem, honorable both to American art and scholarship, and equally fitted to adorn the table of the parlor and the shelves of the library.

We are not surprised that the demand for the "*Dies Iræ*" is greater than the supply, and that a second edition will have soon to be issued.

TIMOTHY TITCOMB'S GOLD FOIL.*—The polished and genial pen of Dr. Holland seems never to tire. Editor, Lecturer, Author, he is alike at home in the newspaper, on the platform, or in the more quiet pages of a book. His graceful periods and appropriate sentiments have won for him a distinguished reputation, not only as editor of the *Springfield Republican*, but as the author of several deservedly popular books. In "Gold Foil," he essayed a higher range than in his earliest book, and with entire success. Around those crystalized thoughts, our popular proverbs, he has gathered a series of beautiful reflections in the once so popular form of essays, and in these often gives us transient, but deeper glances into the real heart of things than can be gotten from more imposing and pretentious authors.

We have also received several Juvenile and Miscellaneous Books, which we have not space to notice.

JUVENILE.

STORIES OF RAINBOW AND LUCKY. By JACOB ABBOTT. Vol. I—Handie. Vol. II—Rainbow's Journey. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

THE FLORENCE STORIES. By JACOB ABBOTT. Florence and John. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

THE OLD BATTLE-GROUND. By J. T. TROWBRIDGE, author of "Father Brighthopes," &c., &c. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

DICK AND HIS FRIEND FIDUS. By CATHARINE M. TROWBRIDGE, author, &c., &c. Philadelphia: Wm. S. & Alfred Martien. 1860.

NO LIE THRIVES: a Tale. By the author of "Charley Burton," &c. Same house.

WILLIE AND NELLIE: or, Stories about Canaries. By COUSIN SARAH. Same house.

THE PERCY FAMILY; through Scotland and England. By DANIEL C. EDDY. Boston: Andrew F. Graves. 1860.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE YOUNG MEN OF AMERICA. A Prize Essay. By SAMUEL BATCHELDER, Jr., (reprinted from the Young Men's Magazine). New-York: Sheldon & Co.

A LIFE FOR A LIFE. By the author of "John Halifax," &c. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THE WIFE'S TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS. By the author of "Grace Hamilton's School Days," &c. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

A GOOD FIGHT AND OTHER TALES. By CHARLES READE, author of "Love me little, love me long," &c. With illustrations. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THE QUEEN OF HEARTS. By WILKIE COLLINS, author of "The Dead Secret," &c. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

* *Gold Foil, hammered from Popular Proverbs.* By TIMOTHY TITCOMB, author of "Letters to the Young." Fifth edition. New-York: Charles Scribner. 1859.

ELEMENTARY GRAMMAR, ETYMOLOGY AND SYNTAX; abridged from the octavo edition of the "English Language in its Elements and Forms." Designed for general use in Common Schools. By WM. C. FOWLER, late Professor of Rhetoric in Amherst College. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

HARRY LEE; OR, HOPE FOR THE POOR. With eight illustrations. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

FISHER'S RIVER (North Carolina) SCENES AND CHARACTERS. By "Skitt," "who was raised thar." Illustrated by John McLenan. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THE VIRGINIANS; A Tale of the Last Century. By W. M. THACKERAY. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The Studien und Kritiken, Heft IV, 1859, contains a biographical and historical sketch of Girolamo Zanchi, one of the most learned theologians of the Reformed Church of the Sixteenth Century, by Prof. Schmidt, of Strassburg, an article by Stitz, on the *Æsthetic* character of the Eucharist and Fasting in the Ancient Church, a Review of Karsten on the Last Things, and the completion of an elaborate paper by Baur on Schleiermacher, whom, in closing, he characterizes as one "who, with a personal character weighty, harmoniously cultivated, and transformed by Christianity, beyond any other man of the century explored and mastered the entire domain of speculative knowledge and practical life." Heft I, 1860, contains a third article from Dr. Rothe on *Dogmatic*, discussing the church doctrine of Scripture, maintaining that it is the "Word of God" in a sense different from that held by the Church, and contesting strongly the doctrine of a verbal and "mechanical" inspiration. Dr. Rothe argues that the Apostles had no different inspiration as writers, from that which accompanied their oral proclamation of the gospel. Dr. Wieseler has an article modifying his former view of speaking with tongues, and abandoning his position that it consisted invariably in a low, inaudible utterance, but re-affirming his view that it *never* consisted properly in speaking in a foreign tongue, which belonged, he conceives, to the charisma of interpretation. There is a paper by Kleinert on the dogma of original sin in the O. T.; an essay on the baptism for the dead in Cor.; a Review of Rudolff's Doctrine of Man in his Spirit, Soul, and Body; of Moll's John Brugman, and the religious life of our fathers in the fourteenth century; of Piper's Mythology and Symbolism of Christian Art.

In die Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Heft IV, 1859, Prof. Wiggers completes his account of the fortunes of Augustinian Anthropology; Dr. Hellfrich contributes portions of "Erasmus' episto

lary intercourse with Spain," and Dr. Otto discusses the use of the N. T. Scriptures in the works of Theophilus of Antioch. Heft I, 1860, contains an article on the history of the Strassburg Anabaptists, from 1527 to 1543.

The *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* IV, Bd. Heft III, has articles on the doctrine of Anti-christ according to Schneckenburger; the necessity of Christ's Expiation; the dogma of Predestination in the Ninth Century; and the doctrine of Paul on the relation of Regeneration, Sanctification, and Good Works to Salvation on the one side, and Justification on the other.

Among recent Theological works, are Holzman's *Kanon und Tradition*, a contribution to the recent history of doctrine and symbolism in the church.—Faith, its Essence, Ground, and Object, (*Der Glaube, sein Wesen, &c.*), is a new work by Dr. Julius Köstlin, Theol. Prof. in Göttingen, 522 pp. 8 vo.—Rationalism, (*Der Rationalismus*) by Dr. Rückert of Jena. Stahl of Berlin, has issued his long expected work on The Lutheran Church and Union. Its author's well-known position as one of the high church leaders, as well as the thoroughness of its discussion, gives it great interest.—Christian Dogmatik, exhibited from the stand-point of the Conscience, by Dr. Schenkel. 2 vols.

Dr. Herzog's Real Encyclopædie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche has reached the 110th Heft, word, *Polemik*. Its contributors are among the ablest and soundest biblical scholars of Germany.

Olshausen's Biblical Commentary is nearly completed. Of the portions yet untranslated into English, Wiesinger has finished James and I Peter, and Ebrard, Revelation and the Epistles of John. The latter (*die Briefe Johannis*) have just appeared, with an appendix on the Catholic Epistles. When completed the whole will be published in this country.

The elaborate and learned commentary of Meyer is also completed. Meyer has had able coadjutors. The Hebrews and Thessalonians are by Dr. Lünemann of Göttingen, and several smaller epistles by Dr. Huther. The Revelation, just published, (*Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch ueber die Offenbarung Johannis*) is by Dr. Fr. Düsterdieck, of Hanover, author of a complete Theological Commentary on the Epistles of John, in three volumes. The three commentaries of De Wette, Meyer, and Olshausen, furnish the student a noble apparatus for New Testament study. That of Meyer is, on the whole, more valuable than De Wette's.

Ecclesiastes, by Dr. Hengstenberg, 274 pp.—Neander on Corinthians, (*Die beiden Briefe an die Cor.*)—Part Second of Keil's Biblical Archaeology (*Handbuch der Bib. Arch.*), on the politico-social relations of the Israelites.—Dr. Wieseler, the learned writer on Sacred Chronology, has given a Commentary on Revelation, with special reference to the doctrines and history of the Apostles, and with a chronological and critical excursus, 622 pp.—We see announced a third volume of Dr. Hupfeld's Commentary on the Psalms (*die Psalmen uebersetzt und ausgelegt*), of which the first volume appeared in 1855, and the second in 1858. Hupfeld is Gesenius' successor at Halle, his equal in learning, and incomparably sounder in his religious views.—Oslander's Commentary on the 2d Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, is highly praised.

One of the most notable recent events connected with Biblical Science is the discovery by Dr. Tischendorf, during his scientific mission into Egypt, of a MS. containing a large portion of the Old Testament, several Apocryphal books, and, what is found in no other ancient MS., the entire New Testament. It is on fine parchment, consists of 346 leaves, each leaf containing four columns, in excellent preservation. Dr. T. decides that it is as old as the fourth century; as old at least as the celebrated Vatican Codex. Dr. T. was copying it for publication. Dr. T.'s MS. contains, also, the entire Epistle of Barnabas, thus supplying the Greek text of the first five chapters, and the first part of the Shepherd of Hermas, of much of which the original was lost.

PATRISTIC LITERATURE.—The Philosophy of the Christian Fathers (*die Phil. der Kirchenväter*), by Dr. J. Huber.—*Hippolytus's Refutation of all the Heresies* has appeared, by Duncker and Schneidenwin, Profs. of Göttingen. The first volume was published in 1856; Prof. Schneidenwin having since died, it has been completed by Prof. Duncker. It is handsomely printed, in two volumes, (about 560 pp. in all), with a Latin translation and notes, chiefly giving various readings.—Dr. Franz Oehler has commenced a "Library of the Fathers," being selections from their works, with the original text and a German translation. The first four volumes contain the most important writings of Gregory of Nyssa, his conversations on the Soul and the Resurrection, his treatises on the Trinity, on the Creation of Man, on Celibacy, and discourses on the Beatitudes, &c., in large 12mo.—Two editions of Epiphanius are also in process of publication, one edited by Dr. Oehler, the other by G. Dindorf.—The Homilies, ascribed to Clemens Romanus (*Clem. Rom. que feruntur Homiliæ*), are edited, for the first time entire, by Dressel.

PHILOSOPHY.—Dr. Henry Ritter, the Coryphæus of Historians of Philosophy, has issued a history of Christian Philosophy, down to the present time, complete in two volumes, (*Die christliche Phil. nach ihrem Begriff, &c.*) It is an entirely new work and popular in character, clear, simple, and fervid in style, and evincing alike the author's ample erudition and his warm religious sympathies.—Volume two of Dr. Röth's history of Occidental Philosophy (*Gesch. unserer abendländischen Phil.*), treats of the transfer of Oriental ideas to Greece, and their modification in the old Ionic and Pythagorean Schools. It is learned and able.

Schwegler's history of Greek Philosophy (*Gesch. der gr. Phil.*), is an excellent manual, edited since his death, by Prof. Köstlin. Among Schwegler's contributions to Literature was an edition of Aristotle's Metaphysics, with a German translation and a copious commentary; an edition of Eusebius's Eccles. Hist., and an excellent outline history of Philosophy, translated by Prof. Seelye. His later years were devoted especially to Roman History and Greek Philosophy. The present work is smaller than his general history, and in some points, even of Greek Philosophy, less satisfactory. But it shows the same skilful hand, and has appropriate references and proof passages. It rejects the Hegelian development theory.—*Platonische Studien*, 78 pp., by H. Bonitz, a learned editor of Aristotle's Metaphysics.

René Descartes and his Reform of Philosophy (*Reform der Phil.*)

from the sources, and critically illustrated by Dr. Schmid of Schwarzenberg.—Lectures on Pantheism and Theism, by Dr. G. Weissenborn.—Köhler: Realism and Nominalism in their influence on the dogmatic systems of the Middle Ages.

CLASSICAL LITERATURE.—The tenth volume of Stallbaum's well known and admirable edition of Plato, containing the Laws and the Epinomis, with Prolegomena and a full commentary, completes the work. Stallbaum is doubtless the first living Platonic scholar, and his skill as a commentator equals his learning. The edition of Plato, in Teubner's excellent series, is by K. F. Hermann, in whose death classical scholarship lost one of her bright ornaments.—Bähr's Herodotus has reached the third volume of an enlarged and improved edition.—The Greek Physicians (*Hippocratis et aliorum medicorum veterum Reliq.*), are under the healing hand of a new editor, Ermerius:—vol. 1, Utrecht.—Greek Antiquities (*Griech. Alterthümer*), by G. F. Schömann, 2 vols., discusses the international relations and religion of the Greeks. Schömann is of the school of Wachsmuth, Hermann, &c., and is thorough master of his subject, and his style has a clearness and vivacity in which that of K. F. Hermann is utterly wanting. The discussions on Greek Religion are highly valuable.

HISTORY, &c.—Gervinus's History of the 19th Century, &c., four volumes.—The Life and Select Writings of Henry Bullinger of Zurich (*Leben und ausgewählten Schriften, &c.*), by Carl Pastolozzi, 1858: of Peter Martyr, by Dr. C. Schmidt: the Life of John Gerson, Prof. of Theol. and Chancellor of the Univ. of Paris, by Schwab, 1859: of Œcolampadius and Myconius of Basle, by Hagenbach, 1859, belong to a valuable series of works pertaining to the founders and fathers of the reformed church.—Pope Gregory VII and his Age, by Prof. Gfrörer, 4 Bd.; learned and thorough.—Lectures on Academic Life and Study (*Vorlesungen ueber academischer Leben und Studium*), by Dr. J. E. Erdmann.

FRANCE.

The Works of Abælard (*Abælardi Opera, &c.*), collected and edited by Victor Cousin, with the aid of Charles Jourdain, vol. 2; vol. 1 appeared in 1850.—Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire: Le Bouddha et la religion, 8. *Logique de Hegel*, translated, with an introduction and a perpetual commentary, by A. Véra; 2 vols.—Le Livre de Job traduit de l'Hebrew, Par Ernest Renan, membre de l'Institute—a study on the age and character of the period. "Essais de morale et Critique," by the same author.—Alfred Maury: Histoire des religions de la Grèce antique depuis leur origine jusqu'à leur complète constitution, 3 vols.—Essai de Philosophie religieuse, Par Emile Laisset.—La Grande Italienne, Par Amadée Renée: a biography of Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, the friend and supporter of Gregory VII.—Dictionnaire de l'Académie des Beaux Arts. Tome, i, p. 1.

ENGLAND.

THEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL SCIENCE.—Vol. i of a Dic. of Biblical Antiquities, Geography, and Natural History, edited by Wm. Smith.

The work will doubtless have the same excellencies as the Dic. of Classical Biog., Geog., &c., edited by the same industrious scholar.—Prof. C. J. Ellicott's Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Ephesians, with a revised Translation: 2d ed., revised and enlarged. This completes, we believe, the excellent Commentaries of Ellicott on Paul's lesser Epistles.—A new ed. of Jowett's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with critical notes and dissertations.—Alford's Greek Testament: a part of the fourth vol., containing Hebrews to 2d Peter.—Dr. Tregelles: Revelation, translated from the Greek text, with an historical sketch of the printed text of the N. T.; a new edition, with a notice of a Palimpsest MS., hitherto unused.—C. H. H. Wright: The Book of Genesis in Hebrew, with a critically revised text, notes, &c.—Winer's N. T. Grammar, vol. ii, translated by Masson.

Paley's Moral Philosophy and Evidences of Christianity have been published, with annotations from the instructive pen of Archbishop Whately.—M'Cosh on the Intuitive Convictions of the Mind.—Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles: Sermons before the University of Cambridge. By Brook Foss Westcott.—The Order of Nature Considered in Reference to the Claims of Education: a third series of Essays, by Baden Powell.

CLASSICAL LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY.—The practical English mind still shows its fondness for Aristotle—"dear old Tottle," as Dr. Arnold calls him. An elaborate edition of his Politics, by Richard Congreve, was published in 1855, and a valuable edition of his Nicomachean Ethics, by Jelf, the translator of Kühner's Gr. Grammar, with a full commentary, in 1856. A new edition of the Ethics is now in process of publication, edited by Sir Alexander Grant, of which two volumes have already appeared. Vol. i consists exclusively of Prolegomena, discussing with great fulness, and much original research, the integrity of the work, the previous history of Greek Ethics, and the leading points of Aristotle's system. Vol. ii contains the first six books of the Text, with copious Explanatory Notes. A third volume will complete this edition of one of the most interesting monuments of Pagan Literature—the first attempt to systematize the principles of moral action. The different practical estimate put by the English on Plato and Aristotle, is exhibited incidentally in the character of the translations of their respective works in Bohn's Classical Series. Those of the works of Aristotle are scholarly, and even elegant; those of Plato are nearly all indifferent, and some scandalously incorrect.

Frederick Jacob's elegant little work, "Hellas; the Home, the History, the Literature, and the Arts of the Greeks," has appeared in an English translation.—The fourth and last volume of Rawlinson's translation of Herodotus is announced as in press. This work, as is well known, embraces notes and excursions which bring the whole range of recent discovery to bear on the illustration of the Father of History.

From Max Müller we have a History of Sanscrit Literature, so far as it illustrates the primitive religion of the Brahmins.—The Philological Essays of the late Richard Garnet, of the British Museum, have been collected.